INDIRA GANDHI

PEOPLES and PROBLEMS

INDIRA GANDHI
PEOPLES and PROBLEMS

Mrs. Indira Gandhi, like her father Jawarharlal Nehru, is no stranger to the heights and troughs of Indian politics. But in two spells as Indian Prime Minister she has established herself as an international statesman of considerable stature. Turning to her speeches one begins to understand why.

PEOPLES AND PROBLEMS contains more than two dozen of her most important speeches from the time she first became Prime Minister of India in January 1966 until the present day. Many of the speeches were delivered to international audiences such as the United Nations in New York, others to forums as diverse as the Sorbonne in Paris, the Indian Science Congress and the National Academy of Sciences in Allahabad.

In these speeches, Mrs. Gandhi adopts the role of spokesman for the developing countries, and of the champion of the cause of non-alignment. Assuming her father's mantle, she speaks out for the countries that were once subjected to European colonialism, and she speaks of the achievements of her own country since independence.

Her speeches concentrate on four main themes. The first is the crusade for the abolition of hunger and poverty, by the development of the resources of the third world for the benefit of the third world.

The second is the conservation of resources. 'The rich out of greed, and the poor out of need, have been reckless in plundering the earth's assets,' she says, adding that it is essential to develop renewable sources of energy, such as bio-gas and solar power, and to avoid depletion of resources that are non-renewable.

The third is the stance of non-alignment. Developing countries, she proclaims, must not fall into the trap of becoming pawns in the power struggle waged between the two super-powers, but must stand aloof from both of them. If developing nations are to achieve their goals of self-sufficiency and prosperity, they must co-operate amongst themselves. This co-operation must be both economic and scientific.

continued on back flap

Rs. 150

PEOPLES AND PROBLEMS

By the same author

INDIA AND BANGLADESH: SELECTED SPEECHES AND STATEMENTS, March–December 1971
INDIA: SPEECHES AND REMINISCENCES

Indira Gandhi

PEOPLES AND PROBLEMS

Gandhi Memorial College
SRINAGAR
Acc. No: 1857
Dated:

25-IV

920
G151P

G.M.C.E.J
1857

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
LONDON SYDNEY AUCKLAND TORONTO
with
B. I. PUBLICATIONS
NEW DELHI BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS

The author wishes to acknowledge the editorial advice and help rendered to her by H. Y. Sharada Prasad and K. Natwar Singh.

B I PUBLICATIONS
Head Office:
54 Janpath, New Delhi – 110001

Regional Offices:
18, Lansdowne Road, Bombay – 400039
13, Govt. Place East, Calcutta – 700069
150, Mount Road, Madras – 600002
13, Daryaganj, New Delhi – 110002

ISBN 0 340 28659 8

Copyright © 1982 by Indira Nehru Gandhi. First printed 1982. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher. *Printed in Great Britain for Hodder and Stoughton Limited and B I Publications by St Edmundsbury Press, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk. Photoset by Rowland Phototypesetting Limited, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk. Hodder and Stoughton Editorial Office: 47 Bedford Square, London WC1B 3DP*

Contents

Introduction 7

1 'A Pledge Renewed' (26.1.66) 9

2 'Tradition and Change' (8.1.67) 13

3 'A Global Strategy for Development' (1.2.68) 19

4 'Tasks before Asian Scientists' (9.8.68) 25

5 'India and the United Nations' (14.10.68) 30

6 'Some Aspects of Our Foreign Policy' (31.8.70) 40

7 'The Unfinished Revolution' (9.9.70) 50

8 'Indo-Belgian Friendship' (25.10.71) 56

9 'Man and His World' (14.6.72) 60

10 'India and the World' (October 1972) 68

11 'A World Without Want' (September 1974) 81

12 'The Modern World' (30.4.75) 100

13 'The Meaning of Non-Alignment' (16.8.76) 109

14 'Grow Rather than Grab Things' (6.3.80) 116

15 'Stimulate Economic Growth Without Damage to Ecological Harmony' (10.3.80) 120

16 'Taking an "All Round Attitude" to Science' (15.5.80) 125

17 'Environmental Protection has no Meaning to the World's Poor – Affluent Nations Know it but Don't Act' (28.7.80) 133

18 'True Inter-Dependence' (4.9.80) 135
19 'Science Must be not a Follower but a Pace Setter' (23.10.80) 139
20 'Commission on Alternative Energy to be set up' (8.1.81) 143
21 'Freedom and Peace' (9.2.81) 148
22 'The Future of Non-Alignment' (11.2.81) 152
23 'Public Health and Developing Countries' (6.5.81) 156
24 'Nature and Energy' (10.8.81) 162
25 'The Role of the Scientist' (8.9.81) 169
26 'The Search for a Global Compact' (23.10.81) 173
27 'The Development of Foreign Policy' (30.10.81) 178
28 'Agriculture: Self-Reliance and Inter-Dependence' (9.11.81) 183
29 'India's Intellectual Tradition' (13.11.81) 195

Introduction

For one who dislikes speech making, I have been making an inordinate number of speeches on a variety of subjects. The reason is not far to find. I was born in an era when my entire country, masses of men and women, educated and illiterate, were aflame with the urge for political freedom, for economic reform and cultural renaissance. This was my consuming passion and one for which I have worked with a singleness of purpose. How fortunate we were in having as our leaders men and women of vision and of high idealism, combined with a knowledge of, and concern for, the practical necessities of our complex society.

Since Independence we have been struggling against tremendous odds to lift India out of its economic backwardness and to make it technologically self-reliant, politically stronger and more stable. We must strengthen ourselves not for dominance nor leadership, but to be able to look after ourselves and to solve our problems. If only for its size, India's stability is essential to harmony in our region.

We cannot serve the world without working for the redressal of the imbalances and inequalities within our own nations. Many of the world's ills are due to the desire for, or the fear of, domination. The world can hope to survive only if nations of varying sizes and levels of development can co-exist without distrust, and be willing to share their endowments on a more equal basis. There cannot be perfect accord, but surely some small area of commonality can be found between peoples and countries. Identifying it and enlarging it can create goodwill and understanding which are the prerequisites of peace. This is what we seek to do. And this is why I have to speak of these matters time and again, often repeating points in the hope of striking sympathetic chords.

India has stayed out of the two power blocs. Through our adherence to non-alignment, we have worked for co-operation on the two major focal points of danger – avoidance of a military conflict and the holding of a dialogue on economic matters between the affluent and developing countries.

A third confrontation is becoming increasingly visible: between human avarice and nature's powers of recuperation and renewal.

Our small earth is a modest satellite of a minor star. Yet it is the cradle of two miracles, life and mind, from which other miracles have sprung. Today it is threatened by its own creations and desires.

Now, the truths long recognised in India's ancient philosophy are being rediscovered and reaffirmed by western scientific experience. Man's potential is limitless, beyond even what he himself can imagine. Yet he remains simultaneously actor and spectator, the manipulator and the manipulated. Growing power brings growing problems.

As knowledge increases, so does awareness of ignorance. Power itself invites vulnerability. A century ago there was confidence that man could conquer nature. Now we are acutely conscious of the world's fragility. Whatever his beliefs or the colour of his skin, the human being is, by and large, governed by the same joys and sorrows.

Actions today mould our tomorrows. We can turn our backs to the sun and cast long shadows on the lives of generations to come, or we can let light, penetrate, illumine the dark patches of the human mind, renew the earth and conserve human and physical resources. The choice is ours.

The time has come to rise above pettiness and to break down meaningless barriers, to join together not just for better things but to reach out for the values which could make us better beings; each one of us adding something no matter how small, to the total of the world's dignity and courage, its happiness and goodness, its beauty and wisdom.

1

'A Pledge Renewed'

The first broadcast as Prime Minister, All India Radio, New Delhi, 26 January 1966

Thirty-six years ago, on this very day, my voice was one of thousands repeating the historic and soul-stirring words of our Pledge of Independence.

In 1947 that pledge was fulfilled. The world acknowledged that a new progressive force, based on democracy and secularism, had emerged. In the seventeen years that Jawaharlal Nehru was Prime Minister, the unity of this country with its diversity of religion, community and language became a reality, and democracy was born and grew roots. We took the first step towards securing a better life for our people by planned economic development. India's voice was always raised in the cause of the liberation of oppressed peoples, bringing hope and courage to many. It was heard, beyond her frontiers, as the voice of peace and reason, promoting friendship and harmony among nations.

During his brief but memorable stewardship, Shastriji enriched the Indian tradition in his own way. He has left our country united and determined to pursue our national objectives. Only yesterday we committed his mortal remains to the sacred rivers. The entire country sorrowed for this great loss. I feel his absence intensely and personally, for I worked closely with him for many years.

My own approach to the vast problems which confront us is one of humility. The tradition left by Gandhiji and my father, however, and my own unbounded faith in the people of India, give me strength and confidence. Time and again, India has given evidence of an indomitable spirit. In recent years, as in the past, she has shown unmistakable courage and the capacity to meet new challenges. There is a firm base of Indianess which will withstand any trial.

The coming months bristle with difficulties. We have innumerable problems requiring urgent action. The rains have failed us, causing drought in many parts. As a result, agricultural production, which is still precariously dependent on weather and rainfall, has suffered a sharp decline. Economic aid from abroad, and earnings from exports, have not come to us in the measure expected. The lack of foreign exchange has hurt industrial production. Let us not be dismayed or discouraged by these unforeseen difficulties. Let us face them boldly. Let us learn from our mistakes and resolve not to let them recur. I hope to talk to you, from time to time, to explain the measures we take and to seek your support for them.

Above all else we must ensure food to our people in this year of scarcity. This is the first duty of government. We shall give urgent attention to the management and equitable distribution of food-grains, both imported and procured at home. We expect full co-operation from state governments and all sections of the people in implementing our plans for rationing, procurement and distribution. Areas like Kerala which are experiencing acute shortage will receive particular attention. We shall try especially to meet the nutritional needs of mothers and children in the scarcity-affected areas to prevent permanent damage to their health. We cannot afford to take risks where basic food is concerned. We propose, therefore, to import large enough quantities of food-grains to bridge this gap. We are grateful to the United States for her sympathetic understanding and prompt help.

Only greater production will solve our food problem. We have now a well thought-out plan to see that water and chemical fertilisers, and new high-yielding varieties of seed, as well as technical advice and credit, reach farmers. Nowhere is self-reliance more urgent than in agriculture, and it means higher production, not only for meeting the domestic needs of a large and increasing population, but also for exports. We have to devise more dynamic ways of drawing upon the time and energy of our rural people and engaging them in tasks of construction. We must breathe new life into the rural works programme and see that the income of the rural labourer is increased.

Our strategy of economic advance assigns a prominent role in the public sector to the rapid expansion of basic industries, power and transport. In our circumstances, this is not only desirable but necessary. It also imposes an obligation to initiate, construct and manage public sector enterprises efficiently and to produce sufficient profits for further investments. Within the framework of our Plans, there is no conflict between the public and private sectors. In our mixed economy, private enterprise has flourished and has received help and support from government. We shall continue to encourage and assist it.

Recent events have compelled us to explore the fullest possibilities of technological self-reliance. How to replace, from domestic sources, the materials we import, the engineering services we purchase, and the know-how we acquire from abroad? Our progress is linked with our ability to invent, improvise, adapt and conserve. We have a reservoir of talented scientists, engineers and technicians. We must make better use of them. Given the opportunity, our scientists and engineers have demonstrated their capacity to achieve outstanding results. Take the shining example of Dr Homi Bhabha and the achievements of the Atomic Energy Establishment. The path shown by Dr Bhabha will remain an inspiration.

Our programmes of economic and social development are encompassed in our Plans. The Third Five-Year-Plan is drawing to a close. We are on the threshold of the Fourth. The size and content of the Fourth Plan received the general endorsement of the National Development Council last September, even while we were preoccupied with the defence of our country. Its detailed formulation was interrupted due to many uncertainties, including that of foreign aid. We propose now to expedite this work. In the meantime, an annual plan has been drawn up for 1966–67, the first year of the Fourth Plan. This takes into account the main elements of the Five-Year-Plan.

In economic development, as in other fields of national activity, there is a disconcerting gap between intention and action. To bridge this gap, we should boldly adopt whatever far-reaching changes in administration may be found necessary. We must introduce new organisational patterns and modern tools and techniques of management and administration. We shall instil into governmental machinery greater efficiency and a sense of urgency, and make it more responsive to the needs of the people.

In keeping with our heritage, we have followed a policy of peace and friendship with all nations, yet reserved to ourselves the right to independent opinion. The principles which have guided our foreign policy are in keeping with the best traditions of our country, and are wholly consistent with our national interest, honour and dignity. They continue to remain valid. During my travels abroad, I have had the privilege of meeting leaders in government and outside, and have always found friendship and an appreciation of our stand. The fundamental principles laid down by my father, to which he and Shastriji dedicated their lives, will continue to guide us. It will be my sincere endeavour to work for the strengthening of peace and international co-operation, so that people in all lands live in equality, free from domination and fear. We seek to maintain the friendliest relations with our neighbours and to resolve any disputes peacefully. The Tashkent Declaration is an expression of these sentiments. We shall fully implement it in letter and spirit.

Peace is our aim, but I am keenly aware of the responsibility of government to preserve the freedom and territorial integrity of the country. We must, therefore, be alert and keep constant vigil, strengthening our defences as necessary.

Peace we want because there is another war to fight – the war against poverty, disease and ignorance. We have promises to keep with our people – of work, food, clothing and shelter, health and education. The weaker and under-privileged sections of our people – all those who require special measures of social security, have always been, and will remain, uppermost in my mind.

Youth must have greater opportunity. The young people of India must recognise that they will get from their country tomorrow what they give her today. The nation expects them to aspire and to excel. The worlds of science and art, of thought and action, beckon to them. There are new frontiers to cross, new horizons to reach, and new goals to achieve.

No matter what our religion, language or state, we are one nation and one people. Let us all – farmers, and workers, teachers and students, scientists and technologists, industrialists, businessmen, politicians and public servants – exert ourselves to the utmost. Let us be strong, tolerant and disciplined, for tolerance and discipline are the very foundations of democracy. The dynamic and progressive society, the just social order which we wish to create, can be achieved only with unity of purpose and through hard work and co-operation.

Today I pledge myself anew to the ideals of the builders of our nation – to democracy and secularism, to planned economic and social advances, to peace and friendship among nations.

Citizens of India, let us revive our faith in the future. Let us affirm our ability to shape our destiny. We are comrades in a mighty adventure. Let us be worthy of it and of our great country. Jai Hind.

2

'Tradition and Change'

Address to the Convocation of Bangalore University, 8 January 1967

Amidst the din and dust of electioneering I have this welcome opportunity of meeting young men and women. Not without reason are you the bridge between today and tomorrow, between continuity and change, between tradition and modernity.

I am not a political person in the narrow sense in which politics is generally understood. It is the occupational hazard of politicians and administrators, to be obsessed with 'now'. Yet the present moment and its problems can be understood only in the context of the flow and direction of history. The present is the road between the past and the future. To pinpoint this and to give a correct perspective should be one of the functions of universities.

All that is born must die and all that dies must be reborn. So we are told in our old philosophy. The world is constantly in the process of renewal. Yet each change encounters obstruction. Some people oppose change consciously; others resist it because they feel safer with the familiar and all change implies the unfamiliar. Thus there is a constant struggle between the votaries of continuity and the forces of change. Even more than other countries, India is undergoing a revolution at all levels of its being – economic, technological and social, as well as intellectual, psychological and aesthetic. We are a society being forced into new dimensions of thought, perception and action by the pressures of new relationships, new tools and techniques and new avenues of communication.

Through the centuries, a way of seeing and thinking, a way of living, has survived in this country. Invasions and wars have modified the traditional background and social patterns, but have not essentially altered the relationships between producer and consumer, between donor and recipient. This was because changes in tools and techniques were slow and gradual, so slow indeed that we had centuries of virtual stagnation.

The crisis which confronts India today is of an entirely different nature. The world has leapt into the nuclear age. The adventure and conquests of science have brought new challenges. It is of the utmost urgency now that the revolution in technology should be matched by an upsurge of intellectual and creative questioning. Without such effort, we shall be condemned to mediocrity, and the hope of new life will wilt. The conflict in India is not primarily one of ideology as such, but a clash between those who cling to old ways of thought and those who want India to understand the changes which are occurring all over the world and to adapt herself to the needs of the second half of the twentieth century.

The resistance offered by old modes of thought to the force of the new explains much that is happening around us. Change and modernity do not necessarily mean breaking with national experience. What is needed is a correct understanding of the meaning of tradition. What we regard as tradition today is itself the product of a continuous evolution. In our religion we have had reformers and rebels challenging earlier beliefs and thus changing accepted values. This is an example of what I mean when I say that tradition involves movement. Tradition is not static, it does not mean being caught in the past. Tradition can also be movement. Only that society can be alive which alone absorbs new challenges and ideas and refuses to let old prejudices and the weight of the past inhibit its attitude and direction. And, to be creatively alive, society must mould the future out of its own experience. It must recognise the difference between mere imitation and assimilation. You cannot be a gardener if you collect only potted plants.

Soon we shall complete twenty years of freedom. In these twenty years we have telescoped the experience of three score years. Economists tell us that the annual rate of economic growth has trebled over this period. The structural and quantitative changes are even more marked. We have laid the firm foundations of economic strength of building up metal, machine and chemical industries. A true measure of the success of our welfare programme is that our children have twenty years added to their life-span. These are signal achievements.

Equally remarkable is the difference in the outlook of women and of youth, and of people of the so-called backward classes. Everywhere, there is more opportunity and less of the self-imposed silence and denial that is bred by timidity. More people have found voice and have learnt to feel that the future is theirs to mould. There is a visible growing spirit of assertion.

All this is on the credit side of the record. But there is also a debit side, in which we must list our inability to reduce the great disparities which exist in India. For millions, the good life which is the objective of all our development is still far away.

When we launched on planned development, we were aware that it would take several years, certainly more than one generation, before we could win even the first battle in the war against poverty. We were also determined that in industrialising ourselves we should avoid the exploitation and misery, the expropriation and force, which accompanied the industrial revolution elsewhere. We wanted the endeavour to modernise our economy to be without the loss of our more cherished values. In other words, the modernisation of our conception did not and does not mean de-indianising ourselves.

At the very dawn of our freedom we made yet another decision that we would bring about technological transformation in conditions of full democracy. This was an experiment not so far attempted elsewhere. In other countries the democratic revolution occurred only after the structure of an industrial society had already been built. In India the process was reversed. In the context of our history, economic changes could only follow the attainment of political freedom. Our movement for independence was itself one of the great democratic movements of the world. It was our delicate task to reconcile the needs of growth and the guarantees of democracy. We have done this, spurning short cuts, but even so we realise that we ought to have generated much more speed. Because of our slowness in working out the blueprint of growth, inequalities continue to bedevil our society.

I should like to discuss some ideas which are not usually considered important enough to be discussed by politicians. I cannot help feeling somewhat concerned at some little changes coming about, each one so small, yet in their totality gradually transforming the face of our country and the nature of our lives. In the name of modernity we are doing violence to our landscape. Hydro-electric works and mining projects choose their own sites. Many of them have necessarily to be located in places hitherto unopened. But our building zeal is not accompanied by a respect for the needs of conservation. We are recklessly cutting down our forests and destroying our wild life. We are constructing buildings which are neither functional nor attractive. Already we have thoughtlessly desecrated the environs of many archaeological monuments by putting up sheds and shelters which are out of harmony with the spirit and the landscape of the place. Many of the memorials we build for our great are no tribute to our taste or judgment. We are encroaching upon open spaces within and outside our cities. Architecture is the most public of all arts. Let us build well not merely because people dwell and work in these houses and offices, but because we commit the coming generations to what we build now.

Our design for development should avoid the more dehumanising effect which tends to accompany urban and industrial growth. Development does not mean imitation of the patterns of living of affluent societies. Our aim should be to provide the bulk of our people a minimum of material goods and services which are also aesthetically satisfying. Development cannot and should not neglect the spirit.

What levels of goods and services should be provided and where the line of satisfaction should be drawn are matters requiring thought and definition. Or else we shall waste our resources and condemn our land to more years of suffering. Is it not strange that even as affluent societies are questioning the value system of their development, we in India seem to be happy to imitate what is being questioned? Must our towns become noisy, congested slums? Must we accept the inevitability of standards of living which are based on waste? These may seem distant problems for a developing country like ours, but actually they are not. Unless our thinking is clear on the perspectives before man, we shall repeat the mistakes of others, become bad imitators and waste-makers. Indeed, in certain fields and among certain sections of our people, we are already doing so. In the interest of the future, we must somehow halt this self-destructive trend.

Recently India has proposed a project for evolving a new concept of the standard of living, particularly for developing countries, to Unesco. Unesco has accepted it. The talent and experience of scientists, of artists and educationists, of thinkers, architects and designers, of technologists, are to be pooled together to study the needs and resources of different societies and to produce new and cheaper materials and blueprints for homes and for places of work and play. The objective is to indicate a way of life which is satisfying and graceful, but within our means. Social barriers need to be broken, new sensitivity needs to be nurtured. What we have proposed to Unesco we must start ourselves. Here is a challenge to our young people.

Some of you have completed your years of preparation and entered various professions. The aim of all professions is to make life richer and better. There is a special reason why I have chosen Bangalore for developing this theme. Bangalore is reputed and it is indeed a garden city. It is a great centre of scientific research. It is the home of several modern industries and the cradle of engineers. Scientists and engineers determine so much of what we can attempt and achieve in the decades to come. I should like them to be specially conscious of the aesthetic element in life. In building a project, if you have to pull down a hundred trees, you must instinctively deem it your responsibility to plant two hundred. And this is also a practical need. We have today drought in parts of the country and I have no doubt that it is due to the fact that we have cut down many of our forests. You must design new kinds of articles of everyday use which even the supposedly poor can afford. No longer does rural India regard bicycles, sewing machines and radios as luxuries. It is only high prices which are preventing increased consumption. Here is a challenge to our would-be industrialists. And it is the task of industrial engineers to mould these goods with an Indian feel.

Long years of active life lie ahead of you. Live them creatively and strive for grace. Life has meaning only through dedication to great causes. There is today a great cause to unite us, whatever our calling or our faith – the liberation of our people from poverty. But with this dedication must go knowledge and judgement.

Discernment is not an inborn gift. It has to be cultivated. 'Good taste grows slowly through the effort to understand what is beyond us, the endeavour to appreciate what we cannot yet understand.' In this phase of conflict between continuity and change, continuity is desirable only if it learns not to obstruct change. Change is inevitable, but it is in us to control its content and direction. It is the challenge of your generation to fuse, in a creative way, the numerous movements set in motion by the thinkers and leaders of our nation in the last hundred and fifty years from Rammohun Roy to Jawaharlal Nehru. You can achieve integrity only when, as the architect Le Corbusier who made our city, Chandigarh, said, 'Your work flows from your own conviction and not from the desire to please nor from the desire to shock.'

It is not enough for taste to be confined to a few. It must spread throughout society. This cannot be achieved through government action. Designers and architects can help the process by marketing goods of better aesthetic content and building better homes. But the people as a whole must learn to appreciate and insist on quality. They must resist encroachments on park lands and places of natural beauty, they must resist indiscriminate felling of trees, they must not allow statues and memorials of poor standards to be put up. Simultaneously they must rediscover the sense of colour and form that was instinctive to our people in the days before foreign influence and rapid industrialisation. Much of this spirit still lingers amongst our rural people, but it is disappearing all too fast, for the old embroidered and intricately woven materials, elaborate wood-carving and many other handicrafts which were beautiful, were time consuming and laborious. What can we do to recover it at least for new uses? Let us seek out elements of colour and significance in traditional apparel, in observances and ways of living. Thus we will be able to regain our individuality and to escape some of the regimentation and drabness of the machine age.

With all the problems of India, you inherit a great heritage and a glorious vision. Nothing worthwhile is achieved without effort and hard work. It has been said that the builders of joy are the children of sorrow. It is for you to build a society free from want and conducting its economic affairs solely for the general good, a society which can bring about change through law and the largest consent, which can find fulfilment in the happiness and equality of its citizens, a society which will ensure a life of enlightenment and will preserve its ancient values and the rich diversity of its culture while forging ahead without fear or prejudice. Such is the society we need to be worthy of greatness.

May I congratulate all those who have today got their degrees and give them my blessings and good wishes for the future? May I also give my good wishes to those who are still studying in the University? For them it is a time for preparation: you are the future taste-makers and pace-setters of society and you must use this opportunity to set the right pace and make the right taste. I wish you happiness and prosperity in this New Year.

3

'A Global Strategy for Development'

Address at the Second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, New Delhi, 1 February 1968

Mr Chairman and distinguished delegates to this conference, may I extend a warm welcome to all of you who have come from many countries, to take part in this great assembly of nations, in a joint endeavour to build a better world. We had greatly looked forward to the distinguished presence of Secretary-General U Thant who, more than any one else, has helped us in our moments of despondency, and urged us to remain true to the ideals embodied in the Charter of the United Nations over which he presides with such distinction. It is a matter of deep regret to us all that he is not here with us today, to launch this truly historic conference, which is no less important for the peace of the world and the well-being of the vast majority of its people, than any other issue confronting us today.

I am glad you have chosen this country for your deliberations. Here you will find the problems which all struggling nations face, and you will see them, if I may say so, projected onto a giant screen. You will see them not as statistics, but in the expectant glances of our bright-eyed young people, and in the anxious faces of their elders. We are conscious that we bear the mark of the storms we have weathered. I hope you will also recognise the spirit of the country, a spirit which has seen our people through countless difficulties, countless natural calamities, and countless man-made complexities. It is the spirit which has inspired our great men through the ages. Some of our problems are centuries old, and some are very new – parched land and bursting cities, illiteracy and the brain-drain.

For more than a hundred years, the most sensitive and perceptive minds in our country have been obsessed with poverty and have striven to remove its causes. Our fight for freedom was itself part of the greater fight to liberate our people from the grip of poverty and the fear of economic insecurity. The vastness of our country makes the challenge so much the greater. Whatever we do must be done for 560,000 villages. In the last fifteen years, we have almost doubled agricultural production, created thirty million jobs, put forty-five million more children in schools, added twenty years to the life-span, and established a base of heavy industry; but we cannot even take time off to think of this as an achievement. We must go on with our work, for what is unfinished is so much larger than what has already been achieved.

In our unending labour, our consolation is that we are not alone. Through the long hard struggle for political independence, we were keenly aware of other nations and of people who were also oppressed by their fellow men. We shared with them the indignities and humiliations of discrimination and exploitation – of this was forged a kinship. It has been our hope and constant endeavour that India should work not only for herself but for the larger world community. At the greatest moment of our lives, when we became free and sovereign, my father pledged us to the service of India. He said, 'The service of India means the service of the millions who suffer. It means the ending of poverty and ignorance and disease and of the inequality of opportunity . . . And so we have to labour and to work, and work hard, to give reality to our dreams. Those dreams are for India, but they are also for the world; for all nations and peoples are too closely knit together today, for any one of them to imagine that it can live apart. Peace has been said to be indivisible, so today is prosperity, and so also is disaster in this One World that can no longer be split into isolated fragments.'

The United Nations was established twenty-three years ago to keep world peace and promote human prosperity. The juxtaposition of peace and prosperity is not a contrivance for stating moral precepts. The two are indissolubly linked together. Without peace there can be no prosperity for any people, rich or poor. And yet, there can be no peace without erasing the harshness of the growing contrast between the rich and the poor. Unless we sense this urgency and use our energy to eradicate the economic causes which make for conflict, men and women will be impelled to revolt, and to use violent means to bring about change.

Wherever a wide gulf has divided the small section of the rich from the vast mass of the poor, the state has either imposed a forced peace on the opposing camps, or faced instability from within. What has been true within a nation is equally valid for the international community. Apart from reducing the inequalities within their social structures, the developing nations must adopt modern technology to create a new balance of benefit to all their citizens. In this endeavour, can we not apply to the problems of the world community the accumulated experience of some of the member states of the United Nations who are now in the vanguard of progress? Can we not co-operate to give meaning and substance to the very concept of a world community? These are the questions before this conference.

This is not the first occasion for the United Nations to address itself to the problems of world poverty and hunger. The Charter of this great organisation calls upon it to work for the removal of want. To achieve this objective, a number of international organisations were set up. In December 1961, the General Assembly declared the Sixties to be the Decade of Development. In June 1964, the first UN Conference on Trade and Development adopted its Final Act, a blueprint drawn up to achieve a better balance in international economic relationships. But we find that concrete action has fallen far short of this declaration. In the meantime, year by year, the needs of the developing nations are becoming more acute, more urgent.

Some success has, of course, been achieved. Funds raised by diverse methods have been invested in the process of development. Difficulties have been studied in depth, and the continuing machinery of this conference has been engaged in a search for solutions. Under the able guidance of its distinguished Secretary-General, the Secretariat has produced valuable documents which I am sure you will find useful. The Group of '77' has even prepared a modest though practical programme of action. Naturally, hope is re-awakened by the presence of so many distinguished statesmen from different parts of the world. But we are also haunted by the fear that an historic opportunity to set the world community firmly on the road to peace and prosperity might again be missed.

Are these fears altogether groundless? The Development Decade is drawing to a close. During the last years, most member states have laboured, individually or collectively, to promote economic advancement in underdeveloped countries. An average growth rate of 4.6 per cent per annum has been achieved, but it dwindles to a mere 2 per cent, if we take into account the increases in population. Anyhow, the average growth rate is at best an imperfect measure of social and economic development. A much surer guide is the *per capita* income, on which, so far, little impact has been made. It is the human aspect – the opportunity for men and women everywhere to lead a fuller life – which is of the utmost importance. So long as the fundamental rights of millions of people in regard to employment, food, shelter and other needs, remain unsatisfied, so long will their urge to rise to their full stature, and serve their fellow men, remain unfulfilled.

This situation is a source of anxiety. The goal is distant. But impatience and dissatisfaction sap our will to persevere. Those who look upon development assistance as repayable charity will inevitably miss the expected gratitude from its beneficiaries. Those who view it as an investment to earn political support, or to collect dividends, or to promote trade, will be disappointed with its meagre returns. At the same time, growing numbers in the developing countries are beginning to look upon external capital and know-how, not as adding to their own strength and helping them achieve economic freedom, but as bonds which increase their dependence on dominate economies. We must all plead guilty to being tempted by the illusion that small efforts can yield big results. This is why we become disenchanted, and international economic co-operation is the first casualty. Thus, domestic pressures mount. Our affluent friends seek to curtail their contribution to development. In turn, the recipients of aid retreat inwards.

Sovereign nations are gathered here. But in some cases the structure of their mutual economic relationships has been inherited from their colonial past. We are all familiar with the part colonialism has played in the exploitation of dependent countries. The dominant powers introduced modern science and industry to agricultural lands. But they developed only those segments of the dependent economies which met metropolitan needs. They did not build the economic base necessary for the development of material and human resources, and for self-generating growth.

Today, the rich nations find it more rewarding to invest their savings in their own security, in advancing their own technology, or even in establishing contacts with distant planets. They find it more interesting to trade amongst themselves than with the developing nations. Their markets and profit patterns are protected by tariff and non-tariff barriers. The efforts of the less developed countries to process their natural products, and increase their share of international trade in manufactured and processed goods, are thus frustrated. The continuous onslaught of synthetics and substitutes further deprives poor nations of the resources to be derived from the use of their own products.

Thus, the gap keeps growing. The technological and scientific advances achieved by industrial nations accelerate this process. While industrial nations naturally use their resources to improve their technology, developing nations do not have even the means to borrow it. Even so, modern technology offers to the developing nations the possibility of avoiding the earlier stages of development and thus of overcoming the challenge of poverty.

How can this possibility be realised? How can nations, now embarking on the difficult task of modernising their economies, be helped to telescope their industrial effort – spread over two to three generations in most advanced countries – into a decade or two? How can they mobilise the immense capital needed for investment in developmental projects, while making at least some provision for social welfare? How long can the hope of a minimum improvement in the standard of personal consumption be postponed, when the people are so conscious of their rights, as well as of the grim realities of their comparative situation? How can economic activities meet the requirements of efficiency and be geared to the achievement of rapid advance, while ensuring the dignity of the human being and guaranteeing to the individual full enjoyment of his fundamental rights?

These conflicts cannot be resolved in a day or even in a decade. Their solution demands patience, understanding, right motivation, and above all, a far greater effort and bigger sacrifice than we have so far volunteered. Poverty corrodes the spirit of the poor and weakens their will to overcome it. The wealth of the prosperous grows in isolation and does not provide support to those who need it. The world economy has no built-in corrective. Economic processes must, therefore, be guided by a moral purpose and directed towards desirable ends, by the political will of the international community. Otherwise, only those nations which have inherited economic advantage from historical accidents can hope to achieve the maximum gains within the area of their political control.

Responsibility for development must primarily be shouldered by the developing nations themselves. Political domination over the process of development by nations which wield economic power is inconsistent with the provisions of the Charter to which all subscribe. What we need is a global strategy of development, an integrated programme of international co-operation, which outlines convergent measures to be undertaken by every member state. The elimination of poverty and the development of impoverished regions are now widely accepted as international obligations. In order to discharge them, it is imperative that the international community finds ways and means to intervene effectively in defining the responsibility of economic power, in matching resources to needs, and in guiding economic forces towards progress and peace.

The distinguished delegates assembled here have the experience of the last seven years of the Development Decade to guide them in their deliberations. Seven years is too short a period for mankind to tire or despair in this unprecedented endeavour. On the contrary, any shortcomings and inadequacies should spur us to a bigger and bolder effort. Remember, millions of people hopefully await your decisions – the growers of jute, copra and cocoa, the miners of manganese and tin, the spinners and the weavers, to mention only a few. Their future is at stake – their own livelihood and the lives of their children, as also the capacity of their governments to provide the base for development.

The consequences of failure are too terrible to contemplate. Years ago, Rabindranath Tagore wrote, 'Power has to be made secure not only against power, but also against weakness; for there lies the peril of its losing balance. The weak are as great a danger for the strong as quicksand for an elephant. They do not assist progress because they do not resist, they only drag down. The people who grow accustomed to wield absolute power over others are apt to forget that by so doing they generate an unseen force which one day will rend that power into pieces.' The question before the advanced nations is not whether they can afford to help the developing nations, but whether they can afford not to do so.

Poverty cannot be the destiny of the majority of mankind. I believe we have the power and the wisdom to give all these people new hope. With this faith, I inaugurate the Second Conference of the United Nations on Trade and Development.

4

‘Tasks before Asian Scientists’

Inaugural address to the Conference on the Application of Science and Technology to the Development of Asia, New Delhi, 9 August 1968

This is an important conference. Its discussions are aimed at the removal of poverty, so that the vast millions of Asia will be enabled to lead the kind of life which, in our times, is regarded as man’s basic right. Asia today means the disinherited millions, whether they live in the desert, the jungle or the crowded deltas. But Asia did not always suggest want and penury. It is the home of many civilisations and of all the great religions. Could these civilisations have grown if they had not been held together by adequate technological mastery? The early Indians, the early Chinese, the Arabs – to name only a few of the great peoples of this continent – made notable discoveries in medicine and mathematics, in astronomy and architecture, in metallurgy and agronomy. In my own country, a great surgeon who lived 2,200 years ago, is said to have used five hundred different instruments and accomplished miracles in plastic surgery. On the periphery of this city you can see an iron pillar which has defied the elements for fifteen hundred years and still stands without rust or blemish.

Asia has had its fair share of scientific discoveries. But a time came when its people, weighed down by the opulence of their rulers, lost the art of innovation and self-renewal. They fell prey to the more vigorous and dynamic societies which possessed newer technologies. It is no wonder that the Industrial Revolution created new empires.

With the passage of time, the innovation cycle began to grow shorter. At first, any new invention could hold the field for several centuries, then perhaps for no more than a century, then only for a few decades.

The Industrial Revolution gave this innovative process a completely new thrust. The pace of change quickened. In contemporary technology, obsolescence is seldom far behind invention.

Technology represents the end-application of science. It calls for a certain social climate and for the economic potential for its speedy and widespread application. Modern science and technology often require large investments, specially in highly trained personnel in numerous categories all along the innovation chain. Asia has regained its freedom. But the gap in technology remains. In some ways, the extraordinary proliferation of new technologies has even widened it. This is one of the sharpest causes of tension in the world, creating situations which are explosive and exploitable.

The developing countries might be backward in science, but they have one advantage. They can sometimes telescope centuries into a few years, take advantage of the experience of others and perhaps even alter the sequence of change. People know about penicillin in our remote villages and aeroplanes have penetrated parts of India which have never seen motor vehicles, bullock-carts or even wheel-barrows.

How does change come about? Often enough it is brought about not by individual entrepreneurs but by the initiative of determined groups, or by whole nations. Japan provides an example of the social transformation induced by a ruler and his advisers. In India and few other countries, the powerful nationalist movements were deeply imbued with the urge for social and economic change.

Asia is at several different stages of economic development. Japan presents a spectacle of modern amenities expanding far and wide. Elsewhere there are villages, some in my country, which do not look very different from what they looked like in the time of the Buddha. Their timelessness attracts refugees from the advanced nations, for progress, as it has evolved in the advanced countries, has so separated man from nature that he is not at peace either with his environment or with himself.

There are many theories on the introduction and progress of economic development and technological change. Amidst a host of others, I should like to indicate a few of the factors which play an important part in this process.

First, there is science itself. We are apt to think of it merely as an aid – a means of helping industry or of bringing greater comfort into our lives. But science does not merely improve the old. Often enough it upsets the old. It creates something that is new to the world and to human consciousness.

Then there is education, not just for a favoured few but for the masses; unfolding knowledge, opening up new worlds and arousing new desires. But much of today's frustration and restlessness is due to the fact that our educational systems are too narrow and inflexible to promote a spirit of understanding and tolerance, and the vision which is essential to meet the challenges of our changing world.

Visible benefit makes the most immediate impact. When individuals or groups are convinced that the adoption of modern science and technology will increase their income and make them stronger, they jettison old beliefs for new ideas and methods. The Indian farmer has often been accused of resisting change. The charge is somewhat unjust. Did he not, in the last century, take to growing crops which were strange to our country, such as tobacco and groundnuts? The cultivation of these imported crops was taken up, even by small farmers, because it meant more and readier money. A similar change is again taking place with the introduction of high-yielding crop varieties. So, while tradition and superstition do hold up progress, we should not underrate the strong pull of modernity and self-interest.

Another important factor is the motivation and endeavour of governments. Ambition is the spur. But the experience of Asia is that unless governments themselves are committed to economic growth, such growth is slow to come. The hundred years before we won our independence provide an example of how slow such growth can be. Our first railways and textile mills were opened in the 1850s. Yet, until the late 1940s, we did not make any locomotives in our country, and hardly any textile machinery. What was lacking was governmental will – for the government was alien and indifferent. Over the same period, Japan came to the forefront in technology because it had its own government and one that was committed to technological change. National temperaments might have played some role, but history has many instances where nations have undergone changes of personality under the influence of determined leadership. The role of the state in bringing about change is well understood in Asia. Hence, national planning has been adopted by many countries, whatever their political ideology.

It is obvious that there can be no economic development without technological change. My father's life-work was to free India from all the shackles, political and economic, which prevented her full flowering, and from the dead weight of outmoded thought. He once said, 'What is planning if not the application of science to our problems?'

In India, we have all the problems peculiar to a developing country, and some of our own. Our size magnifies every problem and programme. If a pilot experiment in agriculture succeeds, at once there is a clamour to apply it to 550,000 villages. Planning on this scale, in a completely democratic set-up, and in conditions where each decision is publicly debated and accepted, adds complications. With all our progress, we still can claim only a partial transformation of our society. We have today 300,000 engineers – a more than five-fold increase since Independence. Our machine-tool output has risen a hundred times. We are now exporters of locomotives, of steel products, of electronic instruments and of radio-isotopes and medicines. In a few months, we hope to commission the first of three nuclear power stations at Tarapur near Bombay. But the vast majority of our people still depend on dry twigs or cattle dung for their home fires.

We still live in many layers, in many ages. Indeed the early stages of development have accentuated disparities. It is only through perseverance, and the steady application of science, that these disparities can be bridged and the backward areas enabled to catch up with the more advanced ones.

We have regarded science as the means of higher production, leading to self-reliance, as well as to the reduction of disparities within society. In our view, the country cannot escape from its backward condition by establishing basic and consumer industries alone, but by applying modern technology to agriculture. We have given every encouragement to agricultural research and to the extension of research to the field.

Ten years ago, our government adopted a Scientific Policy Resolution which stressed the importance of scientific training and research. In working out this policy we have encountered several problems. We train young and able scientists. But it is natural that the advanced countries should provide more and better opportunities for work and job satisfaction. It seems that our investment serves as a form of technical aid in reverse – from a developing country to an advanced country.

There is also a debate regarding foreign technology versus indigenous technology. Science may not know national barriers but patent laws do. Along with foreign aid we receive foreign technology. When we do something for the first time, the import of technological know-how becomes inescapable. Yet many aid agreements are such that we are compelled to buy machinery abroad even when we can make it in India, and to accept foreign technicians when they already exist in

India. The time factor, and the need to avoid risk, force these package-deals on us.

We are conscious that growth cannot be sustained on borrowed or even adapted technology. True self-reliance can come only as we develop the ability to solve our own technological problems. Some are small but they exist on a large scale. How can our villages develop unless a wide range of tools can be placed at their disposal, and modern fuel brought to them at nominal prices. We often hear the term 'intermediate technology'. In this, our scientists and technologists have much to do.

General and technical education has expanded considerably over the past twenty years in India, and we have developed a significant scientific and technological capability in several directions. It is now our endeavour to rationalise the structure of Indian science and to relate it more closely with the processes of planning and development. We must have a 'policy for science' and equally 'science in our policy'.

The field for scientific and technological co-operation is a promising one. There are already some regional exchanges and regional institutions such as the International Rice Institute in Manila and the Thumba Equatorial Rocket Launching Station in Kerala. We have accepted a number of Asian and other trainees, in many of our technological and training institutions and scientific establishments, such as the Bhabha Atomic Research Centre in Bombay. The countries of Asia have much to learn from one another and much to share. We invite such co-operation in a spirit of partnership and friendship. Inter-dependence can be meaningful and mutually beneficial only if it arises out of independence.

I have great pleasure in inaugurating this Conference on the Application of Science and Technology in Asia. I hope it will illuminate new areas of endeavour and of co-operation and will help the nations of Asia, individually and collectively, to carry forward the tremendous work that lies ahead. I wish you every success in your deliberations.

5

'India and the United Nations'

Speech delivered to the United Nations, New York, 14 October 1968

May I welcome you, U Thant, as a dedicated champion of a united and peaceful world. The United Nations represents mankind's hope of evolving something higher, something better; and much of what the United Nations is, and can become, depends on the Secretary-General, on his own personal faith and his conception of the duties of his office. May I congratulate the Nehru Award Committee on choosing U Thant. No choice could have been more apt. May I thank you, Sir, for accepting the honour. It is a vivid proof of your regard for Nehru and India. It binds India and Burma, India and the United Nations, even closer.

Distinction and achievement come from within, not from extraneous factors, but from what a person does to develop his own potentiality. I should like to draw attention to a true instance in U Thant's life and personality. He is a Buddhist. All great religions are records of man's attempt to refine himself. But Buddhism is a religion which speaks not so much of the majesty of a Godhead as of the supremacy of compassion, of peace, of right thought, right attitude, and right action.

U Thant began his life as a teacher. He has a teacher's faith in the possibility of improving minds and hearts. He has a teacher's infinite patience. He has a teacher's gift of pouring out all he has, so that others may grow. The teacher's qualities have stood him in good stead in his work as Secretary-General. He has been a fighter for freedom. He played a notable part in Burma's emergence as a free nation. There can be no peace without freedom and equality. Love of freedom and of peace was what connected U Thant with Jawaharlal Nehru.

'INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS'

Nehru believed and proclaimed that freedom was the first condition of peace. There can be no peace so long as one nation rules over another, or claims superiority by virtue of military might or of race. To Nehru, the end of colonialism and racialism was essential if enduring peace amongst nations was to be established. Years ago, Gandhiji drew attention to a remarkable feature of Nehru's thought, that his nationalism was matched by his internationalism. Neither Gandhiji nor Jawaharlal Nehru ever said, 'My country, right or wrong'. Through his study of history, Jawaharlal Nehru was fully aware of the limitations of nationalism and the dangers of a chauvinistic outlook. He was particularly suspicious of any alliance between nationalism and religious fanaticism, or between militarism and nationalism. He often said how ironical it was that new nations should come into being at a time when nationalism itself has been rendered obsolete by the march of science and technology. It was imperialism which was the cause of this anomaly. Jawaharlal Nehru wanted nations to rise above circumstances and to look to the future. Mr Attlee called Nehru 'the first statesman of the new world to be'. Nehru was conscious of the conflict between nationalism and internationalism. But his efforts were all directed towards resolving that conflict. Through his well thought out foreign policy, he proved that India's national interest lay in working ceaselessly for international peace. Ashoka has been described as the greatest king in the world. He proclaimed that the only true conquests were those of peace. Nehru, conditioned by the stress which Gandhiji laid on truth and non-violence, and by his own study of history, had a repugnance for militarism, and he spoke with his whole being when he endorsed UNESCO's declaration that the defences of peace are to be created in the minds of men, or when he quoted Euripedes to disapprove of 'the hand uplifted in hate'.

As to Gandhiji and Nehru, it will be our effort to work for the fulfilment of their ideals. Nehru had great faith in the United Nations, which he thought was a notable effort towards achieving the unity of man and of upholding the destiny of man. In the presence of the United Nations Secretary-General, I re-affirm India's full support for the United Nations in its work for world peace. We shall always be active in the furtherance of the objectives of the United Nations. We stand for peace and for the settlement of disputes through negotiations, for the gradual reduction of the burden of armaments, old and new. We stand for freedom from colonialism and racialism, for closer co-operation between countries, especially between continents of want and continents of affluence.

The Nehru Award commemorates a votary of peace and a great believer in the destiny of man. The first award has gone to a remarkable person, one whose prayer, passion and daily endeavour is peace. I thank him for the honour he has done us in travelling all this way from the headquarters of the United Nations to accept the award. I give my own, and India's, best wishes for the success of his mission.

I am grateful to you for according me the high honour of addressing this great Assembly. May I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the distinguished office of President of the General Assembly of the United Nations. It is a fitting tribute to Guatemala and to your own personal qualities. I wish you success. I have just come from an instructive and stimulating visit to a number of countries in Latin America and the Caribbean. This enabled me to see the earnest strivings of the peoples of that great continent for social progress and better standards of living.

I should like to pay a special tribute to the Secretary-General. Where others might have been overwhelmed by heart-break, U Thant has persevered, undaunted, in his great work with rare faith, devotion and detachment. It is up to all of us to give him our fullest support.

The United Nations is the trustee of the world's peace and represents the hope of mankind. Its very existence gives us a feeling of assurance that the justice of true causes can be brought fearlessly before the world. This Assembly and the agencies of the United Nations should, in all that they do, sustain those hopes and promote the cause of peace.

Seven years ago, India's first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, addressed this Assembly. He was a believer in seeking areas of agreement and co-operation, and in enlarging them. He advocated before this Assembly a 'new approach to co-operation and the furtherance of the co-operative effort'. The Assembly accepted his suggestion of an International Co-operation Year. The United Nations also launched a Development Decade to promote greater economic co-operation between the rich and the poor nations. Two major international conferences on trade and development were held.

The interest shown by member states in these moves arouse great expectations among the developing countries. We did not seek to share the power of the big powers. We did not ask that they deny the needs of any of their own people in order to fulfil ours. We, who have had twenty years or less of freedom to work for our progress, did not expect miracles of sudden transformation. Only too well do we know how long and hard is the path of development. What we do expect is understanding of the intangible yearnings of peoples who have long been under foreign domination.

Unfortunately, economic co-operation has little progress to show. Nor has there been any notable advance in international co-operation in the political sphere. The reasons for this failure are obvious and many. Economic and military power continue to dominate politics. The desire for spheres of influence still motivates policies and actions. The desire to mould other nations, in the image of one's own, inspires propaganda, and sows seeds of mistrust. Nations continue to place narrow national ends above the larger purposes of peace and universal security.

In India we have been powerfully conditioned by Mahatma Gandhi. We believe that the evolution of individuals and societies depends on the extent to which they exercise self-restraint and abjure the use of force. Jawaharlal Nehru, who combined in himself modern political thought and the basic teaching of Mahatma Gandhi, strove to bring about a new system of relations amongst nations. He was tireless in advocating peaceful co-existence. He believed that in a world rent by conflict, freedom not fear, faith not doubt, confidence not suspicion, would lead to friendship amongst nations.

The concept evoked some response among statesmen and nations, and there was a growing recognition that, however difficult it might seem, peaceful co-existence alone could enable the post-war world to solve its disputes nationally. But this trend has received some severe jolts.

Every now and then violence erupts. Sheer power seemingly prevails over principles, seeking obedience and demanding respect instead of commanding it. Indeed, those who have attempted to eschew the use of force have had to pay the price of restraint. And yet, the world is changing. Implicit faith in the efficacy of, and unquestioning dependence upon, military alliances, as well as the rigidities of the bipolar world, are beginning to break down. Every nation, regardless of its size, is endeavouring to establish its own identity. This encourages the hope that, despite obstacles, the United Nations will be able to help all nations to live in peace and independence.

While there is search for a more equitable and humane world order, force continues to be used to attain political ends and to promote national or global interests. It is not my intention to deal with specific issues. Our views have been stated in this Assembly and elsewhere. But there are some issues which cannot be ignored. The continuance of the tragic conflict in Vietnam is a source of constant anxiety. We fervently hope that conditions will be created to enable the discussions to become more purposeful. The Vietnamese people must be assured of their inherent right to shape their destiny peacefully and without outside interference. We believe that the key to the next step still lies in the total cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam. In advocating this, we are not actuated by a partisan spirit, but by our sincere desire for peace and stability.

Another source of anxiety – the West Asian crisis – also needs to be resolved by political means. There is every opportunity for doing so, if it is recognised that the security, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the states in this part of the world cannot be based on the redrawing of state frontiers by force, or on the basis of permanent hostility.

Essential for a peaceful settlement is the withdrawal of foreign forces from all Arab territories occupied in June last year. The process of the restoration of peace can begin, and Ambassador Jarring's mission be fruitful, only with the clear affirmation that this will be done.

Equally explosive is the continued denial of basic human rights on grounds of race. The consciousness of the world community must be aroused not only against South Africa, where racial discrimination has been elevated to the level of state policy, but against the emergence of racialism in any form in other areas. We must also firmly resist the last vestiges of colonialism. Our freedom and independence will not be complete so long as the people of South West Africa, Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea are denied theirs.

Recent events in Czechoslovakia have cast yet another shadow on the fragile structure of the new world order. The principles of non-interference by one state in the internal affairs of another, of scrupulous respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all states, are essential to the principle of peaceful co-existence. It is of the utmost importance that normal conditions should be restored without delay in Czechoslovakia.

If the use of force in international affairs is not renounced, and the rights of nations and the equality of races are not respected, how can tensions be reduced or the dangers of conflicts avoided? The world is caught in a vicious circle, as a result of which any viable international machinery to regulate relations between states is being progressively undermined, and faces the danger of eventual collapse.

Nuclear weapons today represent the ultimate in force. Thus any attempt to eliminate force as the determining factor in international relations must begin with practical steps towards disarmament. But the nuclear menace has become an accepted fact of life, and the world has developed a certain insensitivity to the nature of the threat. Despite every solemn resolution adopted by this Assembly, states continue to enlarge their capacity for nuclear war. The arms race and the search for more sophisticated weapons have rendered meaningless the concept of the balance of power. Yet, every advance in military technology is accompanied by an effort to maintain a balance of terror. This encourages local wars and undermines the established political authority in those states which are struggling to protect their freedom.

It is by restricting, reducing, and eventually eliminating the growing nuclear menace, that firm foundations for peace can be laid. The limited achievement of the partial test-ban treaty has been off-set by the refusal of some states to halt the testing of nuclear weapons. The problems of insecurity cannot be solved by imposing arbitrary restrictions on those who do not possess nuclear weapons, without any corresponding steps to deal with the basic problem of limiting the stockpiles in the hands of a few powers. How can the urge to acquire nuclear status be controlled so long as this imbalance persists? Unless the powers which possess these weapons are prepared to exercise some self-restraint, collective efforts to rid the world of the nuclear menace cannot bear fruit.

We yearn for peace, not merely because it is good in itself, but because without peace there can be no improvement in the lives of the vast majority of the world's peoples. Development must receive the first priority and must be based on self-reliance. Our peoples expect their governments to build, in one generation, the apparatus of production and distribution which took the present advanced nations several generations to develop, and to telescope the stages of their economic growth. But this acceleration works even more dramatically in favour of the affluent. The chasm between the rich and the poor nations, which is already a source of tension and bitterness in the world, is not decreasing but growing.

The situation is fraught with danger for the future well-being of our world. It is natural that we in the developing countries should be more aware of the peril than those who live in the affluent countries. The peril is on our doorstep, but it is not too far from theirs.

The world has changed, the membership of the United Nations has changed, but attitudes of mind have not. The representatives who are gathered here come from countries with distinct personalities. They have had great civilisations in the past – some known and some yet to be discovered. In the old colonial days, history, geography, culture and civilisations were all viewed from a particular perspective. Even today, to be civilised is held to be synonymous with being westernised. Advanced countries devote large resources to formulating and spreading ideas and doctrines, and they tend to impose on the developing nations their own norms and methods. The pattern of the classical acquisitive society, with its deliberate multiplication of wants is not only unsuited to conditions in our countries, but is positively harmful.

Developing nations have their special problems, and there is much scope for co-operation amongst themselves. Some problems are common, but the conditions in each country differ, and the same remedy cannot be prescribed for all. Those who seek to advise us seldom realise that we need new and different answers to our problems. We need solutions which are suited to our conditions, not imitative theories or techniques grafted on from outside. We must make our own analysis of developments and of how to deal with them. International forums such as this Assembly and the specialised agencies of the United Nations give us the opportunity to place our views before the world. But of what avail is this if we cannot forge the solidarity which would command attention?

The problems which we have, did not confront the advanced nations when they were at a similar stage of economic development. Freedom awakens hope. It generates consciousness of economic, social and political rights. As literacy spreads, as modern communications and close contacts increase with the affluent countries, new expectation and tensions are created.

In India, our effort has been to build democracy and to develop a technologically mature society. Each in itself is a formidable endeavour in a country of our size. Demands grow much faster than the means to fulfil them, but changes do not come about easily. Every step forward meets with impediments created by the forces of the *status quo*. Every step forward, even though intended to end inequality, leads to a phase where inequality becomes more obvious, or where new inequalities come into existence. Let me give an example. We have introduced universal primary education and expanded higher education. We have done so because education is the key to the ending of existing disparities; because it is the greatest influence for modernisation and because it gives full scope to the flowering of the human personality. Certain groups and regions, which are already comparatively better off, however, are able to take greater advantage of the new facilities; for example, the urban areas more than the rural, the rich farmers more than the poorer peasants.

The affluence of the industrialised nations itself attracts and exerts a certain pull on the more fortunate sections in the developing countries, further sharpening the difference between aspirations and their fulfilment. This in turn leads to the alienation of the élite from the rest of society, because they are attracted by the glamour of catching up with their opposite numbers in the advanced countries, while their own society cries out for bread.

We are not unaware of the important developments taking shape within the affluent countries themselves, where increasing numbers have begun to question the purpose of their lives. Poverty and want must be eradicated, for they degrade the human personality. On the other hand, the affluent society, as it has emerged, seems to have become entangled in its own instruments. Dazzled by its own glitter, it has lost sight of the goals it set out to achieve. It is natural, therefore, that societies which have stressed the importance of material possessions should anxiously seek a balance between spiritual and material values. It is still an intellectual groping which lacks articulation, but one can sense it in the restlessness of younger people and students, and in the various forms of protest against traditional or established authority. There is a growing desire to assert individuality in technological societies as they become more uniform and more impersonal. Abundance, without commitment to ideals, will sow the seeds of discontent and invite its own disruption. Prosperity must be integrated with a higher purpose, and it should be the endeavour of all nations – it certainly is ours in India – to achieve harmony between progress and the timeless values of the spirit. We are human and do not always succeed; but, as Mahatma Gandhi said, 'Satisfaction lies in the effort, not in the attainment'.

The individual is no longer content to entrust to others the shaping of his destiny; he wants to be the master of his own fate. So also with nations, which, while co-operating with others, wish to develop and progress according to their own genius and tradition. The question is vital for developing nations, which still have time to chart their own course. The method they use, and the directions they take, will determine their goals.

We welcome any genuine form of international co-operation for the development of underdeveloped areas. At its best, foreign aid represents such an endeavour. But can it not also be legitimately described as a form of enlightened self-interest on the part of the aid-giving countries, especially when it is tied to the purchase of equipment and of know-how from donor countries? In India, aid accounts for only a fifth of our total investment in development. Economic progress is not possible without investment. Not all the investment for Europe's progress came from the sweated labour of European workers and farmers. It came also from the peoples of Asia, Africa and South America who were denied a fair return for their work and their produce. Empires have ended, but the colonial pattern of economy remains with us in one form or another. As exporters of primary agricultural produce and minerals, we know, to our cost, how the terms of trade have steadily gone against us. Aid is only a partial recompense for what the superior economic power of the advanced countries denies us through trade. Trade has the further advantage of placing greater responsibility on the developing nations, leading them towards self-reliance. I urge the nations assembled here to give their fullest support to the work initiated by the two United Nations Conferences on Trade and Development and to persuade the strong to dismantle the economic walls which they have built to defend themselves from the weak. In so doing, they will be fortifying the defences of peace before it is too late.

These are the factors which cause tensions and bitterness, which divide society and lead it away from co-operation and the paths of peace. Fear grips large parts of the world. Sages in my land exhorted us to be free from that which made us afraid, anticipating by thirty centuries those famous words of our own times, that there is nothing to fear but fear itself. No people were so cowed down as my countrymen before Mahatma Gandhi came on the scene. If India was able to grasp freedom, it was because he taught us to overcome fear and hatred and to be absorbed in a cause which was greater than ourselves.

We in India are attuned to the idea that the paths to truth are many and various. An attempt to remake the world in any one image will not be countenanced by the majority of mankind. Our age has been called the space age, but I would call it the age of the people. Revolutionaries, liberators, and political leaders, have always talked of the people, but for the first time now, 'we, the people' does not mean a few representing the many, but the masses themselves, each of whom is poignantly conscious of his own individuality, each one of whom is seeking to assert his rights and to voice his demands.

Through the ages, man has struggled against vastly superior forces. The one constant has been his indomitable spirit. He has pitted his puny frame against nature. He has fought against tremendous odds for freedom, for his beliefs, for an idea or an ideal. Endowed with such a spirit, will man abdicate in favour of the machine or bow to the dominance of tyranny in new garbs? Men have been tortured, men have been killed, but the idea has prevailed.

Two years hence, in 1970, the United Nations will complete twenty-five years. Can we make it a Year of Peace, a starting point of a united endeavour to give mankind the blessings of a durable peace? To this end, let us devote ourselves.

One of our ancient prayers says:

Common be your prayer
Common be your end
Common be your purpose
Common be your deliberation
Common be your desires
Unified be your hearts
United be your intentions
Perfect be the union among you.

6

‘Some Aspects of Our Foreign Policy’

Address to All India Congress Committee Seminar, New Delhi, 31 August 1970

Foreign policy cannot be divorced from a country’s internal policy. Any country, any government, any political party must decide what it believes in, and all its policies must then flow from this basic conviction or belief. What is our foreign policy? Some people take the word ‘non-alignment’ and think that is the whole of our foreign policy. In a way it is not the world ‘non-alignment’, but what ‘non-alignment’ stands for, namely in judging all issues independently. We do not wish to be tied to any group or to any country.

We are today nearer to the twenty-first century than we are to the nineteenth. But, unfortunately, we find that over large portions of the world, thinking is still very much of the nineteenth century. The world has changed; we helped to change it with India’s freedom movement; it changed because India and other countries in Asia and Europe became free. It was the greatest change the world has ever seen. Although it was obvious to us that we would become free and that our freedom would lead to the freedom of other countries, this process came as something of a shock to the colonial powers.

For some time they seemed to be stunned by that shock, but it has not taken them long to recover. And since they have recovered, we see another very subtle change coming over the world, a rather dangerous change, which is that colonialism – open, frank, honest colonialism – has now given way to a veiled neo-colonialism. It has already actually happened in some places, and in others there have been attempts to make it happen.

The difficulties faced by the developing countries are, therefore, still very great. And we can face them not merely with idealism, not merely with sentimentality, but with clear thinking and a hard-headed analysis of the situation. I am glad that this seminar has had the benefit of the analyses of the various people who have spoken here about different problems in different parts of the world. I am told there were certain criticisms. We are used to criticism of our foreign policy because any independent path is so much more difficult to pursue, and so much more difficult for people to understand, than the beaten path.

There are those who say that non-alignment has not served our purpose or that it has not been a success. What is the alternative? Obviously, that we should be aligned. If we should be aligned, then with whom should we be aligned? The choice is between the Eastern and the Western Bloc. Should we be aligned with the Eastern Bloc? Before we go on with alignment, we must recognise that many cracks have appeared in the last few years in both Blocs. Should we join either of these cracked Blocs?

If the question is posed: 'Are we to join the Western Bloc? Are we to join its military alliances? Or do we join the Eastern Bloc and its military alliances?': then I am sure that anybody who looks clearly at this question will immediately come to the conclusion that it would not be in our interest to join either Bloc. We come back, therefore, to the third position, which is outside all Blocs. I do not think it is an idealistic position. I think it is the only hard-headed, practical path that is open to any country which wants to keep itself independent.

Many of those who have been against non-alignment all these years, who criticised my father and myself for trying to pursue this path, do not attack non-alignment as such today, but say that we are not truly non-aligned. The great attack today, the greatest weapon which is used against our foreign policy, is the charge that we are, in effect, following the Soviet line. Perhaps they think that by saying so, they will frighten us into trying to give up our friendship with the Soviet Union. Perhaps they merely think that they will be able to destroy the image of independence which we have amongst our own people and amongst the world. Let us understand that, regardless of what our big newspapers say here, the image of India is very clear outside. It is not an image of a country which follows any group or country; it is an image of a country standing, or trying to stand, squarely on its own feet. It does not mean that they always think we are right. Many countries think that we make mistakes. And on many occasions we go wrong. On all the occasions when we seem to support the western countries, it is the eastern group which says we have gone wrong, or that we have not been strong enough. On those occasions in which we have supported the Soviet Union, or more likely the African–Asian countries, it is the western world which thinks we have gone wrong.

On one occasion, the American Ambassador complained to me that we had supported the Soviet Union on more occasions in the United Nations than we had supported other countries. I said, 'Let us look at each occasion'. I did not have details with me there and then, because this remark was made at a party. But I said: 'If you look at the occasions on which we have seemed to side with the Soviet Union, what do you find? Were they not issues in which India and the developing countries were vitally interested? And if this was so, would it not be more true to say that the Soviet Union had supported the stand taken by the developing countries, by the African and Asian countries, and not that we had gone out of our way to support the Soviet Union?' Afterwards I put this question to the Ministry of External Affairs and when we actually counted up, we found that it was not even true to say that we had voted with the Soviet Union on more occasions than we had voted with other countries. Even the Ambassador's basic point did not turn out to be correct.

So the tendency to make sweeping generalisations is very greatly prevalent, perhaps everywhere. We can only see the situation in our own country. And the tendency to see a subject, or a particular issue, superficially, without studying the background, is also prevalent, not just among the oppressed, but among other sections of our people. It is, therefore, important to go into each subject in some depth.

Basically, what do we want from our foreign policy? What is the ideal we pursue? Is that ideal divorced from the practical interests of the country, or is it allied to them? As it happens, our ideal and our practical interests are the same. No government can afford, however idealistic it may be, to leave or neglect the practical interests of the country. We believed – and we still believe – that freedom is indivisible, that peace is indivisible, that economic prosperity is indivisible. And these are the fundamentals on which our foreign policy is based. We have stood for the freedom of all countries. Even when we were not free, when we were in no position to help other countries, we went out of our way to give them whatever moral and other support we could. And I know that that moral support was welcomed and it did help those countries. Today we take the same stand. We know that joining together with the Afro-Asian group is not going immediately to strengthen any of the countries that belong to that group. But we know, also, that there is no other way of strengthening them either. We share common problems, common difficulties, common threats. And we can face them only by trying to stand on our own feet, by having stability within our own country and by making economic progress. We believe stability and progress can only be achieved if we take a particular economic path – the path of socialism which will give social justice to our people. It is the same social justice in the international sphere for which we stand. We believe that so long as there are poor nations and rich nations, there is bound to be tension. There is not only tension between poor and rich, but there is tension between the rich, because of their desire to control or to influence the developing nations. This is how, in the past, most wars began and that is the reason for much of the tension today. Yet you find that in spite of this tension, again and again, countries try to follow the path which we have advocated, namely the path of conciliation and of trying to solve problems by means of negotiation rather than war.

In my Independence Day speech I spoke about two recent events. No two countries could have fought more bitterly than the Soviet Union and Germany. There have been many wars, but I do not think there has ever been greater bitterness than in the war which took place between these two countries, because the fighting was not merely nation to nation, it was not merely province to province, in Stalingrad it was house-to-house fighting, it was almost a fight for every brick. Perhaps you will remember that while men were fighting, the women were picking up bricks to show that Stalingrad could stand and fight. So you can understand what tremendous feeling and personal involvement there were among the people. And yet, today, these two countries have been able to agree to try and solve their difficulties or problems by talking them over openly, whilst forgetting that bitterness, that hatred, which was not a hatred of a few years but a hatred that went a long way back into history. Yet they made this agreement. Nobody knows if the talks will succeed. Naturally we would like them to succeed. But even if they do not, nonetheless a very important step has been taken, a step which we have tried in this country and in our dealings with other countries. Similarly, there will have been an acceptance of negotiation in what we call Western Asia and what in the western world is called the Middle East.

Now foreign policy has to relate to one's historical and geographical background. We see the world from where we are. Other countries see the world from where they are. So we cannot possibly see things from the same angle. We have certain countries for our neighbours. The relationship we have with them is important. Other countries which are further away are seen from another angle.

We also find that in the making of the foreign policy of any country, and perhaps especially of India, there are certain intangible elements which are just as important or as decisive in forming our point of view. It is perhaps easier to pursue a foreign policy, and fashion one's relations with other countries, if one is a rich and powerful nation. Now India is not a rich or powerful nation, and we have to keep that in view. It is no use going on as if we were. But we have made up for our lack of riches and power with another quality.

Earlier, because we were in the forefront of the freedom struggle, that gave us a certain influence. Because we had leaders of stature, we were able to give inspiration to other countries who were in a similar position to ourselves. Today that situation has changed. All these countries have been free for a number of years; they are all trying to stand on their own feet, and none of them would like to be guided by any other country. They would like to have friends, but they would not like to feel that any one country is superior to them. We ourselves, perhaps, would not like that position. So we can understand that other countries, and especially countries which are smaller than ourselves, do not like that position, and we should take great care that at no time do we give an impression that we want to take a leading position. That would immediately mean that we are trying to push them towards a somewhat backward position.

So when we find ourselves in the situation which we are in, that is, in the sort of extremely difficult economic and political situation in which you are powerless, then either you have to stand firm on your convictions and try to strengthen yourself, or you strengthen yourself through alliances. As I said earlier, there are people in our country who think that we could make alliances, and perhaps make ourselves safer by doing so. I do not think that such borrowed strength can be real strength, and I think the feeling of security which one would gain, could be rather deceptive. It would not be real security, and it could deceive us into a feeling of complacency and lead us into danger later on. The only security is to strengthen our own people and to be confident of ourselves.

I mentioned earlier the intangible elements. These are conviction, courage and national pride. And I would not like anybody to think that the pride which I have in mind is the chauvinistic, narrow-minded pride which consists of being offended or feeling insulted at the slightest thing that happens. It is only a weak nation, lacking in self-confidence, which feels insulted by other people. As I have said in the House, nobody can be degraded except by his own actions; no country can be degraded except by that country's own actions and behaviour. And being poor or weak, in the way we are poor and weak, is not degrading. It is not desirable, and we must change that state of affairs. But by itself it is not a degrading thing. If, because of our poverty and our economic condition and our lack of military or other strength, we were to allow ourselves to give up what is in the national interest, that would be degrading.

So what are we doing? We are trying to strengthen ourselves. We have strengthened ourselves, perhaps slowly; but step by step over the years we have strengthened ourselves not only in the military sense but also in the economic sense. Furthermore, we have stood by what we believe in, regardless of the consequences, in all the forums of the world. And that is why we are respected today. Nobody is going to think ill of us because we come to an understanding with smaller countries, or if we have some difference of opinion with them. On the contrary, people will blame us for trying to throw our weight about, or trying to pressurise small countries if we have any differences with them. Of course, in all such matters the national interest and the national honour must come first, but we must not confuse this with any narrow chauvinistic attitude.

I think it was some British statesman who said that no country is a permanent foe or a permanent friend. Any country must try to be friends with as many countries as possible. As I have said in the AICC,[1] our policy is to strengthen our friendships, to change indifference into friendship, and to lessen hostility where it exists. Sometimes the assertion is made that India has no friends. This is the strangest statement I ever heard. I would like to ask: if we are counting friends, how many countries have friends? I have heard from practically every power – and I include in this some of the very big super-powers – the same complaint, that they have no friends. It just depends on how you count. What is the measuring tape of friendship? It is possible that one of the senses in which people have understood friendship concerns the number of countries that will come to their help when they are at war. How many countries, whom we call friends, would really come to our aid? The fact is that India today has about as many friends as any other country. How we keep those friends, or whether they remain friends, is not dependent merely on what we do, but on what happens to be their national interests at any given time. If it is in their interests, it makes no difference what we do. So, we must try to increase our friendship, but

[1] All India Congress Committee.

all the time we have to be prepared for the situation to change, and for other countries to change their friendships and allegiances. Our whole attitude must be flexible in all these matters.

It does not help us at any time to speak ill of another country. If we want to do something against another country, let us make decisions and act. But if we do not take action, or do not consider action desirable, it does not serve any useful purpose to shout about it. Even the biggest of the super-powers have found that war should be avoided. With all their armies, their power, and their influence, they find themselves unable to get out of the mess they are in. Basic convictions, and belief in certain ideas, cannot change. They are constant, whether in domestic policy or foreign affairs.

As I said earlier, courage and conviction must be allied to an astute, hard-headed analysis of international affairs and events. At all times this analysis has to be devoid of emotion and sentiment. We have found that the very growth of military power in the hands of a few countries is producing its own antithesis. There are nations with military stockpiles of unimaginable destructive potential, who are today unable to use that power. One gun-boat could do much more in olden times than what very much greater arsenals are capable of today, because of the fear of the consequences of using them.

We are friends today with the United States, and the USSR, as well as with a lot of other countries. We are helped by many of these countries and we have tried not to be dependent on any one of them. We have tried to diversity the purchases, even the buying of essentials, by buying from different countries, and at the same time we have tried to become self-sufficient and to stand on our own feet. But, in today's world, no country can be absolutely independent of another. This is a world of inter-dependence. You can be inter-dependent only if you are secure in your own freedom. If you give up part of your freedom, relationships change; then it is not inter-dependence; it becomes something else; it becomes a form of – well, I don't say slavery, but some form of colonialism comes in. In the life of a city in earlier days, each person, or each group, was very much more self-sufficient. They produced everything they needed. They were content with what they could produce. Each community became a complete unit. Today, it is not so. Each city is dependent on other cities; each state is dependent on other states to some extent. This is the situation in the world at large. We may get some of our necessities from developed countries, but developed countries cannot exist, either, without a great many things from elsewhere. We have to see that the relationship is such that it cannot force us into any position which is not in our interest. This is where we have to be firm, and that is why we want to be self-reliant in all essentials so that at no time can anybody say: 'Well, you need this, you cannot get it until you do such-and-such a thing.' This is the position which we have avoided and which we will continue to avoid.

As I said, although we get many essential things from other countries, at no time has this forced us to change our policy in any manner at all. We have stuck to whatever we believe in and the world has respected us for it. So when the United States or the Soviet Union help us either through financial credits, which are wrongly termed 'aid', or by enabling us to produce industrial and defence equipment, we presume that they do it out of their own national self-interest. But our own national interest compels us to build up our economic and defensive strength with the help of whoever will help us to do so, whoever will help us to stand on our own feet. We will not, therefore, allow ourselves to be led away either by anti-Soviet, or by anti-American, hysteria.

As you know, I am going to Lusaka next week to attend the Conference of the Non-aligned and the question has frequently been asked in the last few weeks: 'What good will this conference be, and what do we hope to get out of it?' I personally think that the very fact of meeting a large number of Heads of State and sharing experiences with them is very useful. While we try to keep in touch with people through letters and through our embassies, this does not, and cannot, take the place of personal contact and personal discussions, not in the forum of the Conference, but individually and informally. So this, by itself, would be a very important reason for holding such a conference.

It is amazing to see that when the non-aligned Asian and African nations get together, some newspapers use words like 'jamboree' and 'picnic', but when other nations get together, then those words are never used. They talk of serious meetings and common problems. We do not have common problems, of course. I find it amazing, and what is more amazing is that even when all their predictions turn out to be wrong, they never hesitate to follow the same line and make the same predictions the next time. But nobody now is taken in by this kind of comment, or this kind of reaction. We know that many of the allied countries do not like this non-aligned group to exist, whichever side they are on. The super-powers would like to have spheres of interest. Although we are very friendly with them, we do not like this attitude of theirs and we are certainly not going to help them have these spheres of influence. The only sphere of influence we want is one of friendship and of mutual help, and I think that in the kind of conference of the non-aligned, which is being held in Lusaka, there can be mutual help, especially in the economic sphere. It is not easy because, although many of their problems are the same, their conditions are different, and there are many different pressures on all these countries. But if we are able to help one another, even if only to understand the pressures to some extent, I think this conference will serve a useful purpose. So we meet together to reinforce our economic and political independence, and to tell the world that we want to use our influence in favour of peace. We do not want a balance of power in favour of power, but in favour of peace.

I do not want to go here into the specifics of our dealings with various nations, since Shri Sharma tells us that this has already been done by Sardar Swaran Singh and others who have spoken here before me. But I would like to say that I think that it is possible, through friendship, to outmanoeuvre hostility. And this, indeed, if you read Indian history, is the sum total of our tradition, from the days of the Buddha and the Emperor Ashoka, right down to our own times, the times of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru. These great personages have shown us the essence of our tradition, and Gandhiji, especially, brought this ideal into the very business of daily living, into the hurly-burly of political and economic policy. I think it would be a very great mistake to give this up for what may be considered a temporary gain, as some of our friends of the Right, and sometimes our friends of the Left, keep advising us to do. Our party is the central force in Indian life. We have the responsibility, whereas those who are not in power have the freedom, and the right, to advocate courses which may not necessarily be responsible.

We have seen that our people have risen and have stood and worked as one man in every crisis which the nation has faced, and it is this knowledge that we in India shall defend our freedom, if need be with our bare fists, that has acted as a deterrent to those who may have other thoughts about it. But if we permit this will and determination to be weakened and softened by internal conflict, then no amount of arms will help us. Arms, used by people without conviction, cannot provide any credible backing for a foreign policy. Therefore, while we must have arms to defend our country from any aggression, these arms, this military strength, must be backed by conviction in our ideals, and confidence in ourselves. Both are equally great weapons and without them the other weapons could be dangerous to ourselves, and useless in helping us to defend ourselves. This is the essence of our foreign policy. And if we understand this essence and keep to it, we have a certain amount of manoeuvrability. Why does the Government of India not wish to make categorical statements? Because it is not in our interests to be thought of as inflexible. When we are rigid, it helps our adversaries. They have manoeuvrability, they can move about, while we are stuck. We become a target for anyone.

We must, therefore, have a certain amount of flexibility and manoeuvrability, but as I said, it must be consistent with national interest and honour. We cannot manoeuvre or change where basic convictions and basic ideals, aims, and objectives, are concerned. If we keep this in view, then I think India will not only keep its position but will be able to enhance it, in the world. I certainly hope that all of you who are present here, and other members of our great party, will be able to give this knowledge and understanding to our country and to our people. It is not enough to reach the educated, whom we can reach through seminars; you must go to the villages and the rural areas and explain these matters to the rural people; tell them how closely foreign policy is connected with domestic policy, how closely what happens in far-away countries affects things that happen in our country. It is only then that we will be able to have that united force which can make our country great.

Once again I thank you for giving me this opportunity of placing some of my thoughts before you. I congratulate you on this very good idea and on the excellent manner in which I am told you have been able to translate it into action.

7

'The Unfinished Revolution'

Address to the Non-Aligned Summit Conference, Lusaka, 9 September 1970

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates, I welcome this opportunity to give the greetings of the people of India to the Government and people of Zambia, and to the Heads and Representatives of the nations who have gathered here. President Tito deserves our special thanks. But for his unremitting efforts, this meeting would not perhaps have taken place. We are glad that this Non-aligned Conference is meeting for the first time in southern Africa, close to the spirit, the mood, and the very heart-beat of Africa.

Here, in Lusaka, we can feel the ebb and flow of the continuing battle against the remnants of colonialism in Angola and Mozambique. We can feel the vibrations – of the struggle against the minority Government in Zimbabwe, and the apartheid policies of the racist regime in the Union of South Africa, and of the stirrings of the national movements in Namibia and in Guinea Bissau. These freedom fighters are engaged in the same battle as we ourselves were but recently. They are risking their lives for the same principles that we hold dear. We extend our support to these brave men and women.

As I said, yesterday, the revolution of our times is unfinished; the purpose of this conference is to draw up a clear programme of action to carry it forward. This is the challenge that the decade of the 'seventies places before the non-aligned countries.

Only a short while ago, the issues of war and peace, of the disposal of human beings and their destinies, were decided in a few capitals of the world. It is no longer so, because millions of people in the resurgent continents of Asia, of Africa, of Latin America and the Caribbean, have come into their own. This is because we determined that decisions involving us – whether concerning war and peace, or the direction and pace of our social, economic and political development, could be made only by us, in our own way, and in our own countries. That is how non-alignment was born. It expressed our individual and collective sovereignty, our devotion to freedom and peace, and our urgent need to give to our people a better life and the opportunity to live in freedom, in dignity and in peace. At no time was there any intention to set up a third world.

This is our endeavour. The odds are tremendous. Each step has met with criticism and opposition. But we have carried on. Let us not be deterred by cynics and the hostile propaganda of the powerful media of communication. From the beginning, there has been no lack of inquisitors who looked upon non-alignment as heresy, and distorted its meaning. They said it would not work. But, we can answer back in the famous words of Galileo – 'And yet – it moves'.

The criticism of non-alignment has shifted on two counts. Those who now concede that non-alignment had some utility in the days of the cold war confrontation now maintain that this is no longer so. They no longer revile the basis and the principle, but only the practice.

Have the non-aligned states lost their relevance? The answer is an emphatic no. Twenty-five years after the last holocaust, the world is not yet on the brink of peace. The nuclear balance of terror still confronts us. The war in Vietnam is said to be waged with 'conventional' weapons, yet these include chemical contamination of food and plant life. The only way to have a clean war is not to have a war at all. Hence India stands and works for total disarmament.

The Great Powers certainly have the major responsibility for international peace and security. We welcome all initiatives towards the resolution of differences through negotiation, but even if the Great Powers reach accord on their common interests, and decide upon a mutually acceptable limitation of their strategic arsenals, the rest of the world, of which we form a considerable part, can hardly remain mere onlookers. We have an equal stake in peace, but the quality of that peace should be such as will ensure our own sovereignty and security.

Not only national honour, but national interest, demands that we do not mortgage our right of decision in domestic and international affairs to foreign powers. This is one element of our policy of non-alignment. As the logical corollary, we reject the enmities of our erstwhile rulers. As my father declared: 'We are in no camp – and in no military alliance. The only camp we should like to be in, is the camp of peace, which should include as many countries as possible.' May I thank the Conference for its gracious gesture in memory of my father, and the many distinguished delegates for their kind references to him?

We decided that our respective territories should not be used for the subjugation of other people, for subversion, or for the carving out of spheres of influence. Indian manpower and resources were once used for imperialist purposes. When we gained our freedom, we declared that this would no longer be permitted.

We have all been subjected to domination, exploitation and the humiliation of racial discrimination. We cannot compromise with racialism in any form. The pernicious theory that one man is superior to another, merely on the grounds of race or birth, has been proved to be false, yet it continues to dominate the thinking of many people.

Today's world is a single entity. We are deeply convinced that by staying out of military pacts, the non-aligned countries can use their collective wisdom and influence to tip the balance of power in favour of peace and international co-operation.

These have been the positive achievements of non-alignment. If today belief in the efficacy of military pacts has weakened, if historic animosities are giving way to essays in friendship and co-operation, if a breath of realism is influencing international policies towards détente, the nations assembled here can claim some credit. This should not, however, lull us into complacency.

The big powers have never accepted the validity of non-alignment. Neither colonialism, nor racialism has vanished. They have returned in a new guise. There are subtle intrigues to undermine our self-confidence and to sow dissension and mutual distrust amongst us. Powerful vested interests, domestic and foreign, are combining to erect new structures of neo-colonialism. These dangers can only be forestalled by our being united in our adherence to the basic tenets of non-alignment.

I have touched upon certain general points, but on such an occasion one cannot ignore some of the explosive situations which confront the world.

I should like to take this opportunity to convey our admiration and best wishes to President Nasser for his statesmanship and courage in accepting the ceasefire. We disapprove of Israel's intransigence. Israel should be prevailed upon to comply fully with the UN Security Council Resolution of November 1967. We cannot deny to the people of Palestine their inalienable right to the homeland from which they were exiled.

The situation in south-east Asia has further deteriorated. We are deeply concerned about the spreading of the conflict to Cambodia. All foreign forces should withdraw from the various countries of Indo-China, the lead being taken by the USA. Our assessment, based on talks with the various parties concerned, has led us to believe that a broad-based government, comprising every element in South Vietnam, would pave the way for the success of the Paris talks. Recent developments in Laos indicate the possibility of talks between the two sides there. As Member and Chairman of the International Commission, we have offered our good offices to both the concerned parties for this purpose. To preserve peace and to provide for the reconstruction of this war-torn area, some kind of international convention or agreement should be signed by all the parties to ensure respect for the neutrality, independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of all the Indo-China states.

We have been deeply disturbed by the reported intention of the United Kingdom and other Governments to supply arms to the government of South Africa. This dangerous and retrograde step will threaten the neighbours of South Africa, and the area of the Indian Ocean. Any accretion to South Africa's military capability will abet its policy of apartheid and racial discrimination, and may encourage it to annex other territories. The argument, that this is being done to protect the so-called security of sea routes, is untenable. We would like the Indian Ocean to be an area of peace and co-operation. Foreign military bases will create tension and great-power rivalry.

The spirit of freedom goes hand in hand with the spirit of equality. Beyond the political problems of the Unfinished Revolution, there are complex and difficult economic tasks. A realistic appraisal, however, of our natural resources, our capacities, and our competence, reveals the possibility of our working together to reduce our dependence on those who do not respect our sovereignty, so that economic leverage, for thinly disguised political purposes, cannot be used against us. Neo-colonialism has no sympathy with our efforts to achieve self-reliance. It seeks to perpetuate our position of disadvantage. International markets are so manipulated that primary producing countries have a permanent handicap. The levers of technology are also operated against us by means of agreements and collaboration that is not on an equal footing.

Hence we have to redouble our effort to gain for each nation the opportunity to develop to its full stature. The primary responsibility rests upon each developing country, but we also owe a duty to one another. The fallacy, that there is no complementality between our economies, has so far made it difficult to realise the undoubted potential of mutual co-operation. There is greater complementality amongst our economies than there is between the economies of developed nations. Advanced nations have been more successful in forming instruments of co-operation amongst themselves. Our own effort in this direction has not even begun. The potential for trade and economic co-operation amongst us has been left virtually unexplored. By meeting each other's needs, we could diversify our trade, safeguard it against the caprices of international commerce, and reduce our dependence on middlemen and brokers.

This conference should formulate means for strengthening one another, and design methods for giving due priority, in our national policies, to positive measures for mutual co-operation. Such co-operation will help each of us achieve the capability of inducing these changes in the economic system at global level.

Through the United Nations' Conference on Trade and Development, we have tried to persuade the international community to make changes which are overdue in the economic system. This is now well understood all over the world. Although some have been accepted in principle, their implementation has been tardy. In a few weeks, the Second Development Decade will be launched by the UN General Assembly. So far, there has been little progress in evolving guidelines for international co-operation. Many nations which have the capacity, and if I may say so, the duty, to make a decisive contribution, hedge their statements with reservations. For too long has international co-operation been viewed as a one way traffic from the richer to the poorer nations.

As the Prime Minister of Guyana said yesterday, between ourselves, we possess the major part of the world's natural resources. Our manpower resources are no less plentiful. It should not be beyond our ingenuity to develop these resources, and employ our manpower for the production of wealth for our peoples. Through historical circumstance, economic relations between ourselves have not been developed, only relations between each of us and the erstwhile metropolitan powers. We can now make the first attempts to discover areas of co-operation in many fields of development – generation of power, agriculture, road, rail and telecommunications, the expansion of higher education and the development of training in science and technology. If we decide – and I hope we shall – to make a beginning with this study, India will be glad to play her modest part.

We all recognise the malaise afflicting the development process. We know of the growing gap between developed and developing countries, between the northern and southern hemispheres, of the indifference of the affluent, the disappointments of the First Development Decade, and the failure of the affluent countries to transfer even one per cent of their gross national product. We are painfully familiar with the pitfalls of 'aid', in which most credits are tied to purchases from donor countries, and with the fact that a large portion of new credits always goes to the repayment of old loans. But the question is: must we endlessly wait in the hope that some day the developed countries will undergo a change of heart and acknowledge that disparities in the world are not in their own interest? It would be unrealistic to expect miracles of magnanimity. Even if this should happen, I am afraid that it would be to no avail if the right conditions in our own countries are absent. We must determine to help ourselves, to sacrifice, to pool our resources of knowledge and initiative. We must work together on a bilaterial, regional and multilateral basis.

I know from my own experience, that willpower, unceasing endeavour and the capacity for sacrifice, sustained and strengthened us during our struggle for political independence. These same qualities will help us towards economic freedom.

The power to question is the basis of all human progress. We are free because we questioned the right of others to rule over us. But intellectual and cultural emancipation is just beginning. We are rediscovering ourselves, and the fact is that a country sees things in terms of its own geography and history. Those who dominated the world's political affairs, and manned its economic controls, also held the monopoly of ideas. For years we accepted their values, their image of the world and, strangely enough, even of ourselves. Whether we like it or not, we have been pushed into postures of imitation. We have now to break away from borrowed models of development and evolve models of the worthwhile life, which are more relevant to our own conditions – not necessarily as a group, but as individual countries with distinctive personalities.

The world today is united in peril, the peril from nuclear destruction, but more insidious is the daily pollution of our environment. We should be united in prosperity, and in the blossoming of the spirit of man. The non-aligned countries must be in the vanguard of the movement to create the world of tomorrow and to enrich the content of human life.

The Unfinished Revolution can reach fulfilment if we have faith and confidence in ourselves and the assurance that, however long and arduous the journey ahead, we shall reach our destination.

8

'Indo-Belgian Friendship'

Speech at the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Brussels, 25 October 1971

It is indeed a privilege to address the Royal Institute of International Affairs, and this gives me the opportunity to tell you something about my country and the thinking of the one-seventh of mankind who live there. Each country is so involved in its own problems that it can seldom keep up with trends and events thousands of miles away.

The world is one but each of us sees it from a different angle. There is the national point of view, which depends upon geographical position and historical evolution. There is the personal point of view, largely determined by one's political philosophy and economic status. For two centuries or more, Europe dominated the world. In the present century, the United States and later the Soviet Union came to share this influence. Only after World War II did Asia become a factor in European thinking. Africa appeared on the world scene a little later.

Until the countries of Asia and Africa had struggled for, and won, their freedom, their problems, and even their rich treasure of civilisation and culture, were of concern only to a few scholars and specialists. Now there is better communication and a little more knowledge, but developments in Asia are still measured by the standards and way of living of the affluent countries.

It is twenty-four years since our Independence. Up till then we could have had no foreign or, for that matter, any other policy, since decisions were taken for us, not by us.

My father's interest in freedom and justice was not limited to our own struggle. He came to the meeting of the League Against Imperialism here, in Brussels, in 1926 and met the leaders of other independence movements. Thus he had personal contacts with what was happening in other countries, and he was a true citizen of the world. He gave our nationalist movement clear ideas about the kinds of political institution we wanted in the future, and the manner in which we would conduct our relations with other countries. It is this that enabled us to see our problems not as exclusively Indian, but in the perspective of world problems.

An organic world view unites our internal and external policies. Politically, we have established institutions which, in the words of our own constitution, are informed by a passion 'for political, economic and social justice'. Our democratic impulse owes its origin not so much to legislative institutions, introduced during colonial rule, as to the entire spirit of people's sovereignty which our nationalist movement evoked. Economically, our endeavour is to overcome, as early as possible, our crippling poverty and to lessen the inequalities which were bred by colonialism, feudalism and the delay in adopting modern technology. We are modernising our agriculture, and expanding and diversifying our industrial base, so as to become self-reliant.

Since independence, the economic and social transformation of the country represents a vast qualitative advance. During the first half of this century, under colonial subjugation, India's *per capita* income remained stagnant. The availability of goods and services per person, in the mid-1940s, was roughly the same as at the turn of the century. Our sustained efforts in the years after Independence have enabled the growth of national income to be maintained at a rate of about 3.5 per cent per annum. In recent years the economy has tended to grow at an even faster pace. The country is now self-sufficient in food. With increasing expansion in irrigation facilities and fertiliser output, major breakthroughs are expected in other farm products as well. Starting from a flimsy base of consumer goods, industrial production has attained a wide range and depth of sophistication during the last two decades; the dramatic decline in the death rate, and the perceptible increase in the longevity of our people, reflects the degree of progress. Disparities do remain but the standard of living has risen substantially for all sections of the community, even for those who continue to be under diverse social disabilities. The rigidity of traditional Indian society is weakening. Education, and the political system, have given confidence to our people. Women are participating actively in all fields of life.

India lags behind the industrially advanced countries of the West in terms of material comforts, but it has a pervasive social coherence which provides a firm foundation for accelerated economic growth in the coming years. During the nationalist movement our greatest emphasis was on non-violence, tolerance and diversity within unity. The leadership of Mahatma Gandhi conditioned us to choose the path of settling disputes by peaceful methods. This explains why, from the very moment of our freedom, we have stood for world peace, for non-alignment with military blocs, and for friendship with all nations, irrespective of their political systems.

We have never equated 'non-alignment' with neutrality, or unconcern with world problems, or disassociation from countries belonging to power blocs. To us, the word has meant independence of judgment and action in international affairs, according to the merits of particular issues as they affect our own national interests and world peace. In the bipolar world of the early 'fifties, the very word 'non-alignment' irritated some. But the years have seen a blurring of the rigidity of alignment. Those who swore by alliances are making overtures to members of the opposite camp and to the non-aligned. In the conditions of India, it is not the contest for power that creates the principal problem, it is the stark fact of poverty. The majority of the world's peoples are poor. They could be helped to a better life if their energy and resources, which are today directed towards war, were invested in their own welfare. Problems on our own doorstep naturally tend to loom large.

One new crisis surpasses in its magnitude all the earlier crises which have confronted us. The more than nine million people of East Bengal – practically equal to the population of Belgium – have been terrorised and persecuted by the military rulers of Pakistan, and have been pushed inside our own territory, jeopardising our normal life and our plans for the future. Should the world not take note of this new kind of aggression? This is not a civil war in the conventional sense. It is a genocidal pogrom of civilians merely because they voted democratically. It is the cynical use of helpless human beings as a weapon against a neighbour nation. We, in India, have shown the greatest self-restraint, but there is no doubt that our stability and security are gravely threatened. Indeed, we feel the threat is to the peace of the entire region. The basic cause of this crisis must be remedied. A political solution must be found to this problem and, to be effective, it must be acceptable to the elected representatives of the people of Bangladesh. To hold elections for seats which are not vacant, in the present conditions of repressions and chaos, has no meaning or purpose. It is the responsibility of all those who are interested in peace to create conditions to stop the further influx of refugees, and to enable those who are already in India to return to their homes in safety and dignity and without further delay.

Belgium has been the centre piece of West European unity, that unity which is rightly the most cherished and urgent of your present objectives. Europe, so long rent by discord, is now pooling its resources for the solution of common problems. The European Economic Community is a great experiment in the voluntary co-ordination of national policies for larger regional purposes – not of war, but of peace and development. An alliance for war provokes counteraction. But an alliance for peace has deeper ramifications. We welcome the relaxation of tension in Europe and the treaties signed between the Federal Republic of Germany and the USSR and Poland. We hope that steps to further reduce tension will be taken. We welcome European unity but we hope that it will not be aimed against any region, and that economic arrangements amongst advanced countries will not impose new hardships on those who, like us, are making superhuman efforts to stand on their own feet. Belgium has adopted enlightened policies of international aid to developing countries. The terms of international trade, however, have been steadily worsening for the supplier of primary materials. A positive trade policy designed to help, and not frustrate, the efforts of developing countries would be worthy of the vision for which Belgium is well known.

9

'Man and His World'

Address to the United Nations Conference on Human Environment, Stockholm, 14 June 1972

It is indeed an honour to address this Conference. In itself, it is a fresh expression of the spirit which created the United Nations, namely, concern for the present and future welfare of humanity. It does not aim merely at securing limited agreements, but at establishing peace and harmony in life – among all races and with nature. This gathering represents man's earnest endeavour to understand his own condition and to prolong his tenancy of this planet. A vast amount of detailed preparatory work has gone into the convening of this Conference, guided by the dynamic personality of Mr. Maurice Strong, Secretary-General of the Conference.

I have had the good fortune of growing up with a sense of kinship with nature in all its manifestations. Birds, plants and stones were companions and, sleeping under the star-strewn sky, I became familiar with the names and movements of the constellations. But my deep interest in this, our 'only earth', was not for itself but as a fit home for man.

One cannot be truly human and civilised unless one looks upon, not only all fellow men, but all creation with the eyes of a friend. Throughout India, edicts carved on rocks and iron pillars are reminders that twenty-two centuries ago the Emperor Ashoka defined a king's duty as not merely to protect citizens and punish wrong-doers, but also to preserve wild life and the trees of the forest. Ashoka was the first, and perhaps the only monarch until very recently, to forbid the killing of a large number of species of animals for sport or food, foreshadowing some of the concerns of this Conference. He went further, he regretted the carnage of his military conquests and enjoined his successors to find 'their only pleasure in the peace that comes through righteousness'.

Along with the rest of mankind, we in India – in spite of Ashoka – have been guilty of wanton disregard for the sources of our sustenance. We share your concern at the rapid deterioration of flora and fauna. Some of our own wild life has been wiped out. Vast areas of forest, full of beautiful old trees, mute witnesses of history, have been destroyed. Even though our industrial development is in its infancy, and at its most difficult stage, we are taking various steps to deal with incipient environmental imbalances. The more so because of our concern for the human being – a species which is also imperilled. In poverty, he is threatened by malnutrition and disease; in weakness, by war; in wealth, by the pollution brought about by his own prosperity.

It is sad that in country after country, progress should have become synonymous with an assault on nature. We, who are part of nature, and dependent on her for every need, speak constantly about 'exploiting' nature. When the highest mountain in the world was climbed in 1953, Jawaharlal Nehru objected to the phrase 'conquest of Everest', which he thought arrogant. Is it surprising that this lack of consideration and the constant need to prove one's superiority, should be projected into our treatment of our fellow men? I remember Edward Thompson, a British writer and a good friend of India, once telling Mahatma Gandhi that its wild life was fast disappearing. Remarked the Mahatma: 'It is decreasing in the jungles but it is increasing in the towns!'

We are gathered here under the aegis of the United Nations. We are supposed to belong to the same family, sharing common traits and impelled by the same basic desires; yet we inhabit a divided world.

How can it be otherwise? There is still no recognition of the equality of man, or respect for him as an individual. In matters of colour and race, religion and custom, society is governed by prejudice. Tensions arise because of man's aggressiveness and his notions of superiority. The power of the big stick prevails and it is used not in favour of fair play or beauty, but to chase imaginary windmills – to assume the right to interfere in the affairs of others, and to arrogate authority for actions that would not normally be allowed. Many of the advanced countries of today have reached their present affluence through domination of other races and countries, and exploitation of their own masses and their own natural resources. Their sheer ruthlessness, undisturbed by feelings of compassion or by abstract theories of freedom, equality or justice, gave them a head start. The first stirrings for political rights for the citizen, and economic rights for the toiler, came after considerable advance has been made. The riches and the labour of the colonised countries played no small part in the industralisation and prosperity of the West. Now, as we struggle to create a better life for our people, it is in vastly different circumstances, for obviously with the eagle-eyed watchfulness of today, we cannot indulge in such practices even for a worthwhile purpose. We are bound by our own ideals. We owe allegiance to the principles of the rights of workers and the norms enshrined in the charters of international organisations. Above all, we are answerable to the millions of politically awakened citizens in our own countries. All these make progress costlier and more complicated.

On the one hand the rich look askance at our continuing poverty, on the other they warn us against their own methods. We do not wish to impoverish the environment any further and yet we cannot for a moment forget the grim poverty of large numbers of people. Are not poverty and need the greatest polluters? For instance, unless we are in a position to provide employment and purchasing power for the daily necessities of the tribal people, and those who live in or around our jungles, we cannot prevent them from combing the forests for their livelihood, from poaching and despoiling the vegetation. When they themselves feel deprived, how can we urge the preservation of animals? How can we speak to those who live in villages and in slums about keeping the oceans, the rivers and the air clean, when their own lives are contaminated at the source? The environment cannot be improved in conditions of poverty. Nor can poverty be eradicated without the use of science and technology.

Must there be a conflict between technology and a truly better world, or between enlightenment of the spirit and a higher standard of living? Foreigners sometimes ask what to us seems a very strange question, whether progress in India would not mean a diminution of her spirituality or her values. Is spiritual quality so superficial as to be dependent upon the lack of material comfort? As a country, we are no more or less spiritual than any other, but traditionally our people have respected the spirit of detachment and renunciation. Historically, our great spiritual discoveries were made during periods of comparative affluence. The doctrines of detachment from possessions were developed not as a rationalisation of deprivation, but to prevent comfort and ease from dulling the senses. Spirituality means the enrichment of the spirit, the strengthening of one's inner resources and the stretching of one's range of experience. It is the ability to be still in the midst of activity and vibrantly alive in moments of calm; to separate the essence from circumstances; to accept joy and sorrow with some degree of equanimity. Perception and compassion are the marks of true spirituality.

I am reminded of an incident in one of our tribal areas. The vociferous demand of elder tribal chiefs, that their customs should be left undisturbed, found support from noted anthropologists. In its anxiety that the majority should not submerge the many ethnical, racial and cultural groups in our country, the government of India largely accepted this advice. I was amongst those who entirely approved. A visit to a remote part of our north-east frontier, however, brought me in touch with a different point of view – the protest of the younger elements that while the rest of India was on its way to modernisation, they were being preserved as museum pieces. Could not we say the same to the affluent nations?

For the last quarter of a century, we have been engaged in an enterprise unparalleled in human history – the provision of basic needs for one-sixth of mankind within the span of one or two generations. When we launched into that endeavour our early planners had more than the usual gaps to fill. There was not enough data and there were no helpful books. No guidance could be sought from the experience of other countries because their conditions – political, economic, social and technological – were altogether different. Planning of the kind which we were innovating, had never been used in the context of a mixed economy. But we could not wait. The need to improve conditions for our people was pressing. Planning and action, the amassing of data for improved planning and the action to implement it, was a continuous and overlapping process. Our industrialisation tended to follow the paths which the more advanced countries had traversed earlier. Throughout the '60s, and particularly during the last five years, we encountered a bewildering variety of problems, some due to our own shortcomings, but many inherent in the process, and in existing attitudes. The feeling is growing that we should re-order our priorities and move away from the single-dimensional model, in which growth is viewed from a narrow angle and which seems to accord a higher place to things rather than to people. Such an approach increases our needs but not our enjoyment of life. We should have a more comprehensive approach, centred on man, not as a statistic but as an individual, with many sides to his personality. These problems cannot be treated in isolation but must be regarded as an integral part of the unfolding of the very process of development.

The extreme forms, in which questions of population, or environmental pollution, are posed, obscure the total view of political, economic and social situations. The government of India is one of the few which has an officially sponsored programme of family planning. This programme is making some progress.

We believe that planned families will make for a healthier and more conscious population. But we know also that no programme of population control can be effective without education and without a visible rise in the standard of living. Our own programmes have succeeded in the urban or semi-urban areas. To the very poor, every child is an earner and a helper. We are experimenting with other methods of approach; the family planning programme is being combined with those of maternity and child welfare, nutrition and development in general.

It is an over-simplification to blame all the world's problems on increasing population. Countries with but a small fraction of the world population consume the bulk of the world's production of minerals, fossil fuels and so on. Thus we see that when it comes to the depletion of natural resources and environmental pollution, the increase of one inhabitant in an affluent country, at his level of living, is equivalent to an increase of many Asians, Africans or Latin Americans at their levels of living.

The inherent conflict is not between conservation and development, but between environment and reckless exploitation in the name of efficiency. Historians tell us that the modern age began with the will to freedom of the individual. And the individual came to believe that he had rights with no corresponding obligations. The man who got ahead was the one who commanded admiration. No questions were asked as to the methods employed, or the price which others had had to pay. Industrial civilisation has promoted the concept of the efficient man, he whose entire energies are concentrated on producing as much as possible in a given unit of time and from a given unit of manpower. Groups or individuals who are less competitive and, according to this test, less efficient, are regarded as lesser breeds – for example the older civilisations, the black and brown peoples, women and certain professions. Obsolescence is built into production, and efficiency is based on the creation of goods which are not really needed and which cannot be disposed of, when discarded. What price such efficiency now, and is not the word reckless a more appropriate term for such behaviour?

All the 'isms' of the modern age – even those which in theory disown the private profit principle – assume that man's cardinal interest is in acquisition. The profit motive, individual or collective, seems to overshadow all else. This overriding concern with self and today is the basic cause of the ecological crisis.

Pollution is not a technical problem. The fault lies not in science and technology as such, but in the sense of values of the contemporary world which ignores the rights of others and is oblivious to the longer perspective.

There are grave misgivings that the discussion of ecology may be designed to distract attention from the problems of war and poverty. We have to prove to the disinherited majority of the world that ecology and conservation will not work against their interest but will bring an improvement in their lives. To withhold technology from them would be to deprive them of vast resources of energy and knowledge. This is no longer feasible, nor will it be acceptable.

The environmental problems of developing countries are not the side effects of excessive industrialisation. Rather they reflect the inadequacy of development. The rich countries may look upon development as the cause of environmental destruction, but to use it is the primary means of improving the environment, for living, for providing food, water, sanitation and shelter; and also of making the deserts green and the mountains habitable. The research and perseverance of dedicated people have given us an insight which is likely to play an important part in the shaping of our future plans. We see that however much man hankers after material goods, they can never give him full satisfaction. Thus higher standards of living must be achieved without alienating the people from their heritage or despoiling nature of the beauty, freshness and purity so essential to our lives.

The most urgent and basic question is that of peace. Nothing is so pointless as modern warfare. Nothing destroys so instantly, so completely, as the diabolical weapons which not only kill but maim and deform the living and the yet to be born, which poison the land, and leave long trails of ugliness, barrenness and hopeless desolation. What ecological project can survive a war? The Prime Minister of Sweden, Mr. Olof Palme, has already drawn the attention of the Conference to this in powerful words.

It is clear that the environmental crisis which is confronting the world will profoundly alter the future destiny of our planet. No one among us, whatever his status, strength or circumstance, can remain unaffected. The process of change challenges present international policies. Will the growing awareness of 'one earth' and 'one environment' guide us to the concept of 'one humanity'? Will there be a more equitable sharing of environmental costs and greater international interest in the accelerated progress of the less developed world? Or will it confine itself to one narrow concern, that of exclusive self-sufficiency?

The first essays, in reducing economic and technological disparities, failed because the policies of aid were made to subserve the equations of power. We hope that the renewed emphasis on self-reliance, brought about by the change in the climate of aid, will also promote a search for new criteria regarding human satisfaction. In the meantime, the ecological crisis should not add to the burdens of the weaker nations by introducing new considerations in the political and trade policies of rich nations. It would be ironic if the fight against pollution were to be converted into another business, out of which a few companies, corporations, or nations, would make profits at the cost of the many. Here is a branch of experimentation and discovery in which scientists of all nations should take an interest. They should ensure that their findings are available to all nations, unrestricted by patents. I am glad that the Conference has given thought to this aspect of the problem.

Life is one and the world is one, and all these questions are interlinked. The population explosion, poverty, ignorance and disease, the pollution of our surroundings, the stockpiling of nuclear weapons and biological and chemical agents of destruction, are all part of a vicious circle. Each is important and urgent but dealing with them one by one would be wasted effort.

It serves little purpose to dwell on the past or to apportion blame, for none of us is blameless. If some are able to dominate others, this is at least partially due to the weakness, the lack of unity, and the temptation to gain some advantage on the part of those who submit. If the prosperous have been exploiting the needy, can we honestly claim that in our own societies, people do not take advantage of the weak?

We must re-evaluate the fundamentals in which our respective civic societies are based, and the ideals by which they are sustained. If there is to be change of heart, a change of direction and methods of functioning, no organisation or country – no matter how well intentioned – can achieve it. While each country must deal with that aspect of the problem which is most relevant to it, it is obvious that all countries must unite in an overall endeavour. There is no alternative to a co-operative approach, on a global scale, to the entire spectrum of our problems.

I have referred to some problems which seem to me to be the underlying causes of the present crises in our civilisation. This is not in the expectation that this Conference can achieve miracles, or solve all the world's difficulties, but in the hope that the opinions of each nation will be kept in focus, that these problems will be viewed in perspective and each project devised as a part of the whole.

On a previous occasion I have spoken of the unfinished revolution in our countries. I am now convinced that this can only be taken to its culmination if it is accompanied by a revolution in social thinking. In 1968, at the Fourteenth General Conference of UNESCO, the Indian delegation, along with others, proposed a new and major programme entitled 'a design for living'. It is essential to grasp the full implications of technical advance and its impact on different sections and groups. We do not want to put the clock back or resign ourselves to a simplistic natural state. We want new directions in the wiser use of the knowledge and the tools with which science equips us. And this cannot be just one upsurge but a continuous search into cause and effect, an unending effort to match technology with higher levels of thinking. We must concern ourselves, not only with the kind of world we want, but also with the kind of man who should inhabit it. Surely we do not desire a society divided into those who condition and those who are conditioned. We want thinking people, capable of spontaneous, self-directed activity, who are interested and interesting and who are imbued with compassion and concern for others.

It will not be easy for large societies to change their style of living. They cannot be coerced to do so, nor can governmental action suffice. People can be motivated, can be urged to participate in better alternatives.

It has been my experience that people who are at cross purposes with nature are cynical about mankind and ill at ease with themselves. Modern man must re-establish an unbroken link with nature and with life. He must again learn to invoke the energy of growing things and to recognise, as did the ancients in India centuries ago, that one can take from the earth and the atmosphere only so much as one puts back into them. In their 'Hymn to Earth', the sages of the *Atharva Veda* chanted:

> What of thee I dig out, let that quickly grow over,
> Let me not hit they vitals, or the heart.

So can man himself be vital and of good heart and conscious of his own responsibility.

10

'India and the World'

October 1972

This year India celebrates the twenty-fifth anniversary of her independence. These have been years of change and turmoil everywhere. Deep surging forces have torn asunder our past colonial feudal structures and have combined with the tides sweeping the world to give our post-independence evolution its unique qualities. But our own unvarying concerns have been two: to safeguard our independence and to overcome the blight of poverty.

Many crises and dangers from within and without have obstructed our path but we have taken them in our stride. Contrary to predictions, the country has not broken into warring states. We have not succumbed to civil anarchy. There has been no widespread starvation; on the contrary, we have become self-sufficient in cereals. We have not jettisoned our free institutions, but have instead gained greater political cohesion and economic strength. This does not justify complacency, but it does give us confidence that the Indian people can rise to whatever challenge the future may hold. Under Mahatma Gandhi's inspiration, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and the Congress movement formulated a set of principles which have served as our guidelines and which are still valid for us. These are democracy, socialism and secularism, so far as our internal affairs are concerned, and non-alignment in our external relations. One or the other of these principles has been the subject of criticism within this country and abroad. But generally speaking, internally, there is a more mature awareness of the forces and compulsions of our age, and these principles have come to form the essential elements of a national programme accepted by virtually all sections of our people, even though there are differences of interpretation, and differences regarding tactics. The massive majority with which the Congress Party was returned to power in the fifth general election in 1971, and the state elections in 1972, is an indication of this.

What holds people together is not religion, not race, not language, not even a commitment to an economic system. It is shared experience and involvement in the conscious and continuous attempt to resolve internal differences through political means. It is a sense of 'Indianness' which unites our people despite ethnic, linguistic and religious diversity. Most conflicts and tensions in the world originate in the failure to take note of the importance of nationalism.

II

Two centuries and more of history marked by foreign intervention, domination and exploitation, left India backward, apathetic and stagnant. The general scene was one of decay, reflected in the misery of the masses. For us, political independence became inseparable from economic freedom, which in turn could only be meaningful to the extent that it served the interests not just of the few but of the many, of the nation as a whole. Hence our energies at home have been chiefly directed toward the reconstruction of our society.

Our national movement was committed not to a doctrine but to a purpose – the modernisation of our society without loss of the Indian personality; the development and integration of industry and agriculture through modern science and technology; the uplift of the masses and the ending of archaic, hierarchical systems in which discrimination and exploitation had become entrenched.

In the economic field, it was clear from the beginning that we could not rely only on private enterprise and the play of market forces, that we would have to establish social control over the key sectors of the economy and adopt measures of economic planning appropriate to the stage of development reached. Our socialism is not a ready-made ideology but a flexible concept. Three successive Five-Year Plans have been implemented and we are halfway through the Fourth. None of them was beyond criticism in formulation or execution, and yet the overall progress of the last twenty-five years is by no means negligible. We have an impressive record of diversifying our industrial capacity and raising industrial output. The Indian peasant has quickly responded to the new strategy, with the state providing irrigation, improved seeds, better implements, fertilisers and pesticides. So marked has been the development of our industry and agriculture, our science and technology, our education and health, that some argue that India should not now be counted among the underdeveloped nations.

Although we have acquired certain features of an industrial state, and although some classes and groups of our people are visibly prosperous, the vast majority still live in poverty, and a substantial minority in crushing poverty. Moreover, the process of development has widened the disparities between different social classes, and has created new imbalances between states and between districts within the same state.

Our very progress has drawn attention to the inadequacy of our achievement and to the magnitude of the tasks that still lie ahead. But it has increased our capacity to deal with them. We realise that reliance on stereotyped processes of economic growth will not make an appreciable impact on the living conditions of the masses for decades to come. Hence, a basic review of our economic policies is now under way. We propose a more direct assault on poverty and its major manifestation, unemployment. Our next Five-Year Plan will emphasise investment and production programmes which are closely related to a minimum level of consumption for all, and are linked to the provision of employment opportunities on an extensive scale. This gigantic enterprise calls for institutional changes and innovations.

These radical policies do not conform to the code of capitalism, and they may not adhere to orthodox doctrines of socialism, but they are desired by the great majority of our people. The privileged do not hide their misgivings. Reform, as in every country where it has been an issue, is being hotly debated. Some of the more glaring inequities of the land system, e.g. absentee landlordism, were removed immediately after independence but the just redistribution of land and consolidation of holdings are yet to be satisfactorily completed. Industrialisation and urbanisation have given rise to new problems and have further accentuated disparities. Our commitment to democracy, however, is fundamental. Indian socialism is not a negation of democracy but its fulfilment, and democracy will be imperilled only in the measure by which we fail through lack of foresight, or want of courage, to respond to the aspirations of our people.

The resources for our economic development have come mostly from the sacrifices of our own people, but we have also received aid from abroad in the form of credits for the purchase of industrial equipment and food. Although aid was originally conceived of as external assistance for supplementing the self-help measures of developing countries, we have found that it is often used by some creditor governments as an instrument to enforce their short-term policy objectives and to secure political and economic concessions unrelated to our development. Aid is effective only if it is guided by considerations of development, and when there is assurance of its continuity, and not when it can be suspended or withdrawn abruptly. While aid is generally tied to purchases from donor countries, repayment under many of the agreements has to be made in freely convertible foreign currencies, adding to our burdens. At present more than half of the external assistance to us goes for repayments of earlier debts. It is our policy to reduce reliance on aid progressively. We are determined to mobilise our internal resources and technological capacity more intensively.

III

Indian's foreign policy is a projection of the values which we have cherished through the centuries as well as our current concerns. We are not tied to the traditional concepts of a foreign policy designed to safeguard overseas possessions, investments, the carving out of spheres of influence and the erection of *cordons sanitaires*. We are not interested in exporting ideologies.

Our first concern has been to prevent any erosion of our independence. For that reason we avoided becoming camp followers of any power, however rich or strong. We had an equal interest in the maintenance and safeguarding of international peace as an essential condition of India's economic, social and political development. In the bipolar world which existed in the immediate postwar era, Jawaharlal Nehru refused to join either bloc. He decided to remain non-aligned as a means of safeguarding our independence and contributing to the maintenance of world peace. Non-alignment implied neither non-involvement nor neutrality. It was and is an assertion of our freedom to judge and to act. We have not hesitated to express our views on any major controversy or to support just causes.

In conformity with the objectives of our foreign policy, India sought friendship with every nation. We did not allow past conflicts to impede our new links with Britain within the framework of the Commonwealth. The problem of French possessions in India, unlike those held by the Portuguese, was solved in a civilised manner by peaceful negotiations. Therefore, our relations with France grew in cordiality.

We have similar relations with the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic and other European countries, both East and West. With the non-aligned countries in Asia, the Middle East, North Africa and Africa south of the Sahara, there exist special understanding and co-operation based on a common interest in safeguarding freedom and a common struggle against colonialism, neo-colonialism and racialism. We have friendships with the countries of Latin America whose concern with problems of development is similar to ours. India has always held Japan in esteem as a dynamic Asian country, and our co-operation with Japan is steadily growing.

We have also tried to have normal relations with Pakistan. Yet successive governments of Pakistan based the survival and unity of their country on the idea of confrontation with India. This has stood in the way of co-operation which would have been to our mutual benefit. India was partitioned in 1947 to solve what the British portrayed as irreconcilable Hindu–Moslem antagonism. Pakistan was based on the medieval notion that religion alone constituted nationhood. Encouraged by the imperial power, the Moslem League claimed that Moslem majority areas were entitled to become an independent nation. Thus, Pakistan was born a geographical curiosity, its two halves separated by a thousand miles of Indian territory. India was left with a very large number of Moslems; they formed the largest of her many minorities. In keeping with her old tradition and the spirit of her nationalist movement, India adopted secularism – i.e. non-discrimination on grounds of religion – as a fundamental state principle. Equal rights and equal protection have been vouchsafed to the followers of all religions. The Moslem population of India has grown since partition from 35 million to 61 million. It is noteworthy that the 1971 census showed that there are 14 million Christians and 17 million others, including Sikhs, Buddhists, Jains, Parsees and Jews.

Pakistan, on the other hand, clung to the political ideology which had led to partition. Those who came to power in Pakistan had sided with the colonial power in undivided India and had opposed the national struggle. These ruling elements, especially after the establishment of a military dictatorship, set Pakistan on a course of pointless and seemingly endless conflict with India. Just as in the earlier days when the colonial power had used religious sentiments to blunt the nationalist drive in India, some powers sought to use Pakistan to offset India. Pakistan joined military alliances, which had been formed ostensibly to contain international communism, but which Pakistan used primarily in order to acquire weapons to be used against India. Moreover, it suited the West to play off Pakistan against India. China gave military assistance to Pakistan for the same purpose. So did the Soviet Union, later on, in order to maintain its leverage, but it soon discovered the hazards. The consequence of this assistance was to strengthen the militarist oligarchy in Pakistan and inhibit the growth of democratic forces there. Hatred and suspicion of India were whipped up to maintain those in power and to divert the Pakistan people's attention from their demands. Since India remained outside military systems, our defence capacity, unlike that of Pakistan, had to be built up out of our own resources. We have bought defence equipment from a number of countries, particularly after the Chinese invasion of 1962 when we received very modest assistance from the United States and the United Kingdom.

Kashmir, as early as October 1947, was the first victim of aggression by Pakistan. This was at a time when there were no Indian forces at all in Kashmir – as acknowledged by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, at that time, in the UN Security Council. A large part of that state has been under Pakistan's occupation for many years. India does not intend to recapture this territory by force; on several occasions we have given this assurance to Pakistan and have offered to conclude a 'no war' pact. Pakistan repeatedly has rejected this offer, trying to invoke third-party intervention in our affairs. Infiltrators and saboteurs have been sent into Kashmir and other territories, notably in the north east. Early in 1965, our Kitch area was invaded, and later the same year the infiltration was escalated into an attack on Kashmir which led to fighting all along the western front.

The immediate background to the latest aggression against us in 1971 was the other battle which Pakistan had been waging for many months against its own citizens of East Pakistan (as it then was). India had no part in the internal developments of Pakistan – West or East. We would normally have welcomed the attainment of freedom by any victim of colonial oppression but usually it would have had little direct impact on us. Bangladesh, however, was a part of our subcontinent. How could we have ignored a conflict which took place on our very border and overflowed into our own territory? Ten million destitute refugees poured into areas not only densely populated but also politically sensitive as a result of the activities of Marxists and the left-wing extremists we call Naxalites. This posed unbearable strains on our economy and on our social and administrative institutions. The terrible stories of genocide, and the comings and goings of Mukti Bahini, the resistance force of Bangladesh, created a volatile situation for us also.

Could we have remained indifferent to these developments?

As I told the leaders of the various countries which I visited in October 1971, the situation could not remain static. Several border clashes took place during these tense months, and there was one serious skirmish in November; but we treated these as local incidents. In the last week of November, President Yahya Khan publicly announced that war would begin in ten days and, sure enough, on the tenth day there was a massive air attack on seven of our cities and a ground attack all along our western border. Thus did Pakistan extend its war to India.

However, when fourteen days later, on 16 December 1971, Pakistani troops surrendered on the eastern front, India unilaterally announced a ceasefire also on the western front. On 25 March 1972, we withdrew our troops from Bangladesh in consultation with the new government. The political map of the subcontinent has been redrawn and the notion of an inherent and insuperable antagonism between a secular India and a predominantly Moslem state has been discredited – not through any design on our part but because the idea itself was untenable and because the military dictatorship of Pakistan, totally alienated from its own people, had followed a short-sighted and unrealistic policy. In his address to the nation on 27 June 1972, President Bhutto gave a perceptive account of events when he said: 'The war we have lost was not of our making. I had warned against it but my warning fell on the deaf ears of a power-drunk junta. They recklessly plunged our people into the war, and involved us in an intolerable surrender, and lost us half our country. The junta did not know how to make peace nor did it know how to make war.'

The shock of these events compelled Pakistan to exchange military dictatorship for civilian rule, and opened the door to new possibilities for the peaceful resolution of the basic issues between the two countries. I took the initiative to invite President Bhutto for discussions. These have resulted in the Simla Agreement of 2 July 1972, by which Pakistan and India have proclaimed their determination to solve their conflicts bilaterally and without recourse to force, and to seek a durable peace and growing economic and cultural co-operation. The agreement, which holds the promise of settlement of the Kashmir and boundary problems, has been welcomed by almost all sections of the Indian people. It is my hope that the implementation of this agreement, in the spirit in which it was made, will end the twenty-five year period of Pakistan's hatred of India, and that both countries will become good neighbours. I appreciate the courage and realistic approach which enabled President Bhutto to come to India. If Pakistan also shows the wisdom to come to terms with Bangladesh which, under Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, is building a secular, Socialist-oriented democracy, the subcontinent will at long last have overcome the main obstacle to its progress.

IV

I have dwelt at length on Pakistan and the problems of the subcontinent, for their impact on us is immediate and deep. But we want better relations with China also. Even when we were fully absorbed in our own struggle for liberty, we supported China's parallel fight against imperialism and sent a medical team to Mao Tse-tung's Eighth Route Army. We have respect for their culture and cherish memories of past contacts. We were among the first in 1949 to welcome the establishment of the People's Republic.

Much to our disappointment, the last two decades have failed to fulfil our initial hope that India and China, both great Asian nations, newly independent and faced with similar problems, would learn from, and assist, each other and so co-operate on the wider international scene. We began, as we thought, with mutual confidence and good will, but the events of the 1950s brought tension and misunderstanding, culminating in the entry of Chinese troops and their occupation of thousands of square miles of Indian territory in 1962.

It would be an oversimplification to regard this merely as the result of a border dispute. Simultaneous or subsequent developments – such as China's systematic support of Pakistan against India, her provocative criticism of India for alleged subservience to the United States, and later the Soviet Union, and her persistent though futile efforts to promote internal subversion – leave us no option but to infer that the border dispute was the outcome of a more complex policy aimed at undermining India's stability and at obstructing her rapid and orderly progress. After the Cultural Revolution, conditions seem more tranquil, and there appears to be a new orientation of China's policies. We wonder whether this new mood will also be reflected in China's policy toward India. The earlier faint signs of a thaw have receded since China's unreserved support of General Yahya Khan's campaign against Bangladesh and India. We are not engaged in any competition with China, nor have we any hostile intentions. We hope that some day China will appreciate that co-operative and friendly relations between the 560 million people of India and the 700 million people of China are in our mutual interest.

Apart from the Soviet leaders, I think my father was the first Prime Minister to pay a state visit to China. Similarly, the exchange of visits with the leaders of the Soviet Union was memorable in that it was the first time since the October Revolution that a non-communist personality of Nehru's stature, and the head of a non-Communist government, was welcomed officially by the Soviet government; it was the first time, also, that Soviet leaders travelled in a country outside the Socialist bloc. The talks, held in Moscow and Delhi, resulted in a significant measure of understanding that had more than bilateral implications. They demonstrated that it was possible for two countries, such as India and the Soviet Union, to maintain good relations and to work together in a friendly spirit, in spite of very different social systems, and without either having to modify its policies or sacrifice its philosophy and traditions.

The Soviet Union shares the Indian view on the maintenance of peace and the elimination of racialism and colonialism. On these issues it has supported the Afro-Asian stand in the United Nations and elsewhere. When matters vitally concerning our national security and integrity, such as Goa, Kashmir and more lately Bangladesh, became subjects of international controversy, the Soviet assessment of the merits of the case coincided largely with our own. In strictly bilateral terms also, there has been a steady increase in the range and volume of our co-operation – economic, commercial and cultural – to our mutual advantage. Economic relations with the Soviet Union are easier for us since we repay them through the export of our commodities. This mode of payment makes the Soviet credits self-liquidating.

The Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation, concluded last year, grew logically from this expanding relationship. It affirms the determination of both countries to co-operate in various fields and to consult one another, if need be, on suitable measures to safeguard their peace and security. There is nothing in the treaty to which any reasonable person or government could take exception. It contains no secret clauses, nor is it aimed against any country. Yet there have been some misapprehensions that the treaty dilutes India's non-alignment. It is strange that such criticism comes mostly from those who have vehemently denounced non-alignment all along. In the text of the treaty itself there is explicit recognition and endorsement of India's policy of non-alignment.

V

Our relations with the United States began well. At that time, the American people and government showed considerable sympathy for the colonial peoples who were struggling for independence, and particularly for India. This phase was short-lived, however. With the rise of the United States to a dominant world position, Washington's concern and respect for the national independence of India receded into the background. Everything was viewed solely in the context of checking communism and containing first the Soviet Union, subsequently China, and now once again the Soviet Union. There was a feverish building of military blocs and a continuous extension of a network of bases stretching across oceans and continents. The logical and practical consequence of this policy was to divide the world into two opposing camps and to expect each country to belong to one or the other – preferably the Western bloc.

A newly freed people, jealous of their independence, could not resign themselves to this position, nor could we isolate ourselves from what was happening around us. Successive United States administrations have ignored the fact that India must see her problems and her relationships in a different perspective. They have insisted on interpreting our non-alignment as a form of neutralism which they imagined to be slanted in favour of Russia. India was regarded with disapproval and resentment because of her independent policy. This could not but affect the bilateral relations between India and America. Despite fluctuations of mood, our relationship as a whole has been uneasy over a long period.

To our grave concern, United States policy, as it developed, impinged seriously on our vital interests. The admission of Pakistan into the United States controlled system of alliances and the massive supply of arms to Pakistan were ostensibly part of the United States' grand design against communism, but we cannot believe that the United States administration was unaware that these weapons could be and would be used only against India. We took considerable pains to point this out but our protests went unheeded.

Should not the people of the United States ask their government what they have gained from America's activities in Europe and in Asia? Has the United States succeeded in containing communism? On the contrary, has not the United States government been compelled to build bridges with the non-aligned and to woo the opposite bloc – the hated Communists? I have no doubt that if we had followed the advice of the Western bloc, conditions in India would have deteriorated and the extremists would have been strengthened.

In regard to Bangladesh, the United States openly backed Pakistan during the December war, at the cost of basic human values. This further strained our relations. I do not wish to analyse the United States' role at that time or go into the misrepresentations which were circulated. But it is necessary to take note of the dispatch of the warship *Enterprise* to support a ruthless military dictatorship and to intimidate a democracy, and of the extraordinary similarity of the attitudes adopted by the United States and China. Imagine our feelings. The original misunderstanding with the United States had arisen because of our contacts with China, the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. We find it difficult to understand why, when the United States' policy toward these countries changed, the resentment against us increased.

We do not believe in permanent estrangement. We admire the achievements of the American people. Indeed, a large number of Americans expressed sympathetic support for the cause of Bangladesh and India during the last year. We are grateful for assistance from the United States in many areas of our development. We are ready to join in any serious effort to arrive at a deeper appreciation of each other's points of view and to improve relations. A great power must take into account the existence not only of countries with comparable power, but of the multitude of others who are no longer willing to be pawns on a global chessboard. Above all, the United States has yet to resolve the inner contradiction between the traditions of the founding fathers and of Lincoln, and the external image it gives of a super-power pursuing the cold logic of power politics.

On fundamental questions such as disarmament, the abolition of nuclear weapons, the continuing struggle against colonialism and racialism, the widening gulf between the haves and have-nots, the war in Vietnam and the conflict in the Middle East, our stand has been consistent over the years and has been clearly stated in appropriate forums. In this article I have preferred to focus attention on the situation on our subcontinent, because it is our special concern, and has a significance beyond geographical frontiers. In considering the policies of some major powers, I have confined myself to bilateral relations which are intimately connected with their attitudes to the subcontinent as a whole.

VI

The international scene with which we had become familiar has considerably altered. Do the two recent summit meetings in Peking and Moscow indicate that communism and anti-communism will no longer be the ultimate criteria of political and moral values, and that peaceful co-existence, which India has been advocating all these years, will be the governing consideration in international dealings? Whatever the motivation, the wisdom of these new approaches is beyond question, provided that the spirit of détente is also extended to other parts of the world. We cannot be sure if these flexible relationships necessarily point to a more stable world order. Co-existence by itself does not preclude policies, separately or in concert, which are detrimental to the freedom and interests of third countries. For example, co-ordinated action in the Security Council, between China and the United States last year, operated against an immediate restoration of peace in Bangladesh in keeping with the rights of its people. Agreements which promote the doctrine of the balance of power, or which mark out spheres of influence, are bound to increase tension and invite instability. No nation will be happy in a subservient rôle.

Europe has avoided war for more than two decades and is now attempting to build a framework of security and co-operation. But peace is indivisible and so long as there are conflicts and dissensions in Asia there will be no peace in the world. Asia has cradled many civilisations and contains a substantial section of the world's population. For more than two centuries, it has been drained of its resources and wealth which have contributed in no small measure to the industrial advance and affluence of the West. The countries of Asia are now politically free but the continuing interplay of international forces impedes our struggle against economic backwardness and the shadows of the past. We share many problems which can be solved by co-operation amongst ourselves more easily than by obtaining outside assistance, which has tended to cause misunderstanding amongst us and which was motivated more by self-interest than by a genuine understanding of our needs.

Each country has its own heritage and distinct personality, which it naturally wishes to develop in its own way. But we must also bear in mind our community of interests and take positive initiatives for working together amongst ourselves, and with other countries, in order to make a richer contribution toward the evolution of a world more liveable-in for all, and of a social order more in consonance with the yearnings of modern man.

11

'A World Without Want'

Article written in September 1974, published in the *Britannica Book of the Year 1975*

Two-thirds of the world's peoples are underprivileged, and this despite such breathtaking achievements of science as space travel, instant communication, and the unravelling of the very building blocks of life. Technology has given us the knowledge to supplement, or to provide substitutes for what nature provides. Yet many hundreds of millions remain under-nourished and are denied the necessary minimum of clothing, shelter, medical care, and education.

Why does this paradox exist? Natural resources are unevenly distributed, and some countries have acquired tremendous economic power because of their advanced technology. Individual and national self-centredness is to the fore, and there is no feeling of collective responsibility. The world is still at the stage of economic nationalism.

I belong to a generation that spent its childhood and youth (the so-called years of careless rapture!) fighting every inch of the way for our basic human rights as citizens of an ancient and honourable land. It was a hard life, of sacrifice and insecurity, of anger and impatience. Yet the hope in our eyes and our hearts never dimmed, for we were beckoned by the star of freedom, by the bright promise of a world without want and exploitation. Can it be only twenty-seven years ago? Science, the key to the new world for which we longed, has not been allowed to serve those whose need is greatest, but has been made to pander to the desire for profit and to narrow national objectives. Not only has it not provided more, we are now faced by dire forecasts of global food inadequacies, and in today's world even the richest countries are experiencing shortages of one article or another.

Many countries labelled 'developing' are the very lands where civilisation first began. Poor today, though rich in their contribution to the story of man, Iraq, Egypt, India, Iran, and China were among the early cradles of intellect and endeavour. Here man first became a farmer, a breeder of plants, and a metallurgist. Here he fathomed the mysteries of mathematics and medicine, the movements of stars in the sky and of thoughts in his own mind. The first seers in India arose among farmers, singing the praise of the earth, of water, and of the sun, and celebrating the energy of all things that grow. From the sun comes rain, they said, and from rain, food, and from food, all living beings.

Until two hundred years ago, India was regarded as the world's most prosperous country, a magnet for traders, seafarers, and military adventurers. The wealth of Akbar the Mughal is computed at several score times that of the Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V, or of Louis XIV of France. Yet in his reign – as in those of the others – the common people lived in poverty. The multitude starved, while the nobles lived in splendour. Even in those days there were large irrigation works in countries like China and India, but famines were not unusual. Among countries, as within countries, there have always been rich and poor. Military power and looting led to the impoverishment of the vanquished and the enrichment of the victor.

Until the modern idea of social engineering arose, only small and compact societies could avoid inequality. In earlier times, the larger the extent and the greater the efficiency of government, the wider the gap between the few rich and the mass of the poor. The Industrial Revolution and the rise of colonialism sharpened international disparities. Even the difference in the life span of people in western Europe and southern Asia is a consequence of Europe's early lead in science, for until the beginning of the nineteenth century, there was little difference in the mortality rates of most countries. But the present affluence of the advanced countries is due as much to colonial exploitation as to mastery of science and modern technology.

The pace of a country's technological advance depends upon the stock of technology it has already accumulated. Any survey of elementary human needs and the means to fulfil them reveals that over-abundance and deprivation exist side by side. In western Europe and North America, their main concern is to restrict the intake of calories, for their average consumption is twenty-two per cent greater than what the body needs. Elsewhere, entire nations suffer from malnutrition. For us, in India, scarcity is only a missed monsoon away.

The Meaning of Want

The definition of want is not constant. Increasing income, in a time of transition from one stage of technology to another, brings many changes in its train – in habits as well as in the very concept of what is desirable. Additional earnings are only partly spent on more food and other necessities – the rest goes into a display of the symbols of the newly acquired status. To give only one example, in India, the rise in the income scale has meant giving up millets for rice and wheat, and discarding regional costumes in favour of modern city clothes. Need has a psychological, no less than an economic, connotation.

There are at least three kinds of want: first, a shortage of the essentials of existence, such as a minimum level of nutrition, clothing, and housing; secondly, the absence of those elements, such as education and recreation, that give meaning and purpose to life; and thirdly, the absence of those extras proclaimed by advertising as necessary to good living.

Mahatma Gandhi once said that the hungry see God in the form of bread. Many millions are not yet vouchsafed this grace. The *per capita* availability of grain in the less developed countries is hardly 200 kg a year, whereas in developed countries it is close to 1,000 kg. It should be noted that nearly ninety per cent of the consumption of grain in developed countries is indirect, as it is first converted into meat and poultry. In 1970, the rich countries used some three hundred and seventy-five million metric tons of cereals to feed animals, a quantity greater than the total cereal consumption by human beings and domesticated animals in China and India put together. The noted economist, Barbara Ward, has computed that, since 1967, the United States has added to its grain-beef conversion rate almost the entire equivalent of India's level of consumption. Meanwhile, according to a UN estimate, the demand for food between 1970 and 1985 will grow by twenty-seven per cent in developed countries and by seventy-two per cent in developing countries.

A Basic Inequality

The world food problem highlights the massive and continuing injustice that exists in the control of the world's resources – which, we have lately begun to realise, are not unlimited. Land is unevenly distributed. On a *per capita* basis, the United States and the Soviet Union have close to 0.9 ha. of arable land. Canada has 2 ha. and Australia more than 3 ha. The distribution of other resources – in particular, of technology and material inputs – has also been unequal.

Is it not remarkable that, in spite of these disadvantages, developing countries as a group were able to achieve, over the last decade, a growth rate in agricultural production close to that of the industrial countries? But their demands have grown even faster, due to increases in population, and *per capita* income, and changed eating habits. To a great extent, this gap has had to be filled by the transfer of food surpluses, mostly those of the rich countries of North America. The United States and Canada have controlled a larger share of the world's exportable grain supplies than the Middle East does of the world's oil.

The mechanism of food aid saved the farmers of the rich countries from the disastrous decline in income that surplus production would have caused. For decades these countries restricted acreage and actually paid their farmers not to grow crops! Although the United States has now ended restrictions on acreage, the increases in its domestic consumption, and changes in the pattern of trade and in attitudes towards aid, mean that there can be no long term dependence on North American surpluses. It is an urgent necessity for developing countries to improve their domestic production. That is the only sure basis for sustained growth in other sectors.

In 1970, technological and other experts had prophesied widespread famine in India, but for us it was a year of plenty; our new agricultural policy bore abundant fruit and we were able to accumulate a buffer stock of nine million metric tons of grain. But the year following brought an unforeseen event – ten million refugees, and a war followed by an acute drought. Aid was stalled. Our surpluses were depleted, though we managed to get by with marginal imports. Then we were hit by the world financial crisis and the sky-rocketing price of oil. In addition, drought has persisted in successive seasons.

The Present Food Crisis

The current worldwide concern over food is a poignant consequence of the events that have occurred since 1972. Drought made itself felt across whole continents, causing production to fall simultaneously in the Soviet Union, China, India, parts of Africa, and South East Asia. Total world production of cereals went down by four per cent or more than thirty million metric tons. In such a situation it was natural for food-surplus countries to make the most of their advantage. Grain prices rose to dizzy heights, adding to the already escalating forces of worldwide inflation and compounding the problems of developing countries already staggered by steep increases in the price of oil. In the absence of an international system governing trade in grain, the limited stocks that were available in 'surplus' countries were distributed, through bilateral trade, to those who could afford to pay.

India's current balance of payments problem is almost entirely due to the high price of food, fertilisers and oil. We are exploring every possibility of substituting other fuels to meet the energy needs of our economy, but what can take the place of food and fertilisers? Fertiliser is in short supply all over the world because of high oil prices and because the demand in developed countries has increased tremendously. I have read that the United States uses three million metric tons of fertiliser just to keep its lawns green. This is more than the entire supply available to India to grow food in 1971.

Africa illustrates the severity of the present food crisis along with its untapped potential for higher production. In the Sahelian zone of Africa, drought conditions have persisted for a number of years. In several countries of the same continent, however, the land-to-man ratio is favourable, and there is ample opportunity to develop the land once the tsetse fly and other disease carriers have been brought under control. It has been estimated that when this is accomplished, an area of nearly seven million square kilometres – larger than the entire agricultural area of the United States – can be brought under cultivation.

World grain stocks have slumped to a precariously low level. In 1961 they totalled one hundred and fifty-four million metric tons and, in addition, land deliberately withheld from production represented a potential output of some seventy million metric tons. In 1974 grain stocks were estimated at eighty-nine million metric tons, the equivalent of barely four weeks' consumption, and there is little idle land left in 'surplus' countries. The capacity of the world to meet a sudden adverse turn in the weather is thus greatly reduced.

The demand for food may exceed its potential supply for many years to come. According to estimates of the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation, the world production of cereals, currently about one thousand, two hundred million metric tons, will have to increase on an average by twenty-five million metric tons each year to meet the rising demand. By 1985, developing countries might face a total annual deficit of nearly eighty-five million metric tons in grain. Nor is this dismal prognosis of a gaping chasm, between what is likely to be available and what is needed, confined to less developed countries. James J. Needham, Chairman of the New York Stock Exchange, has said that in the period 1974–85, capital will fall approximately six hundred and fifty billion dollars short of U.S. economic requirements.

Our needs must be met in three distinct ways:

1. Increased production in developing countries.
2. Assurance of some internationally controlled supplies to meet abnormal shortages that might occur in a bad year.
3. Generation of adequate purchasing power by the developing countries to finance necessary imports.

Increasing Food Supplies

The first step is clearly the responsibility of the developing countries themselves. They must get their priorities right and provide for investment in the improvement of land, the use of water, the production of fertiliser, and the development of technologies needed to increase food production. In affluent nations, both agriculture and industry use mass-production techniques. Agriculture itself has become an industry in which fewer people cultivate ever increasing areas with the help of machines. With such capital-intensive technology, productivity is high and so are individual incomes. In India, on the other hand, we face a situation where more and more people will have to cultivate progressively smaller areas of land. Unemployment figures in India appear most depressing when employment is calculated in terms of *per capita* production. This is the basis of our poverty. Our most urgent task, therefore, is to augment productivity through the scientific use of our biological and physical assets.

This goal can be achieved only through widespread involvement of the rural community in scientific methods of farming in which every individual can participate. Unfortunately, even in agriculture, much of the planning has been based on the model of mass production evolved in affluent countries, without regard to our peculiar circumstances. The experts with their technical knowledge take over and the men and women most concerned, those whom our programmes directly affect, tend to be relegated to the sidelines as somewhat bewildered spectators.

The interest and enthusiasm of farmers and their wives must be aroused, not only in increasing production, but in seeing that the grain reaches the market on time. Scientific farming should be part of the all-round development of the village. And women play a very important part in all aspects of village life – economic, political, and cultural. They have been left out of most of the programmes of development, and their relevance to the achievement of our goals has not been appreciated.

India has many sophisticated and large-scale industries, but vast areas and large groups of people are untouched by them, and the pressure on land continues to be excessive. Life is hard in the rural areas. We cannot, therefore, neglect small-scale industries and village crafts that could be greatly improved by intermediate technology. Far from being incompatible with modernisation, intermediate technology is a step in that direction. It is intended to increase efficiency and to lighten drudgery, without alienating people from their environment. In developing societies there will always be room for processes that create work for people where they live, using local materials, without the necessity for imports or high investment.

The indiscriminate adoption of the norms and practices of opulent societies has led to a disorientation of values and aesthetic feeling. In their emulation of international trends, architects in tropical countries will sometimes even forget climatic conditions. It is delightful to sit in an air-conditioned room, but what if this diverts power from essential production in field and factory? Labour-saving methods are welcome when they save time and money, but not when they seal off possible sources of employment. In many branches of engineering, especially agricultural engineering, there should be many-faceted research into methods that make fuller use of the experience and capability of the local people and of the materials with which they are familiar. This may well lead to patterns of satisfaction that are very different from those of advanced countries.

The Need For Modern Agricultural Programmes

In irrigated areas, employment can be increased through multiple cropping. Scientific dry farming is more suited to semi-arid regions. Tropical and subtropical regions are fortunate in having abundant sunlight; with an adequate water supply and sufficient nutrients, one crop or another can be grown during each of the twelve months. The Indicative World Plan prepared by FAO acknowledges that multiple cropping will have to play a dominant role in increasing employment opportunities and reducing underemployment in the rural areas of the tropics. In the Indo-Gangetic plain of northern India there is a large underground reserve of water. Some of our farmers have developed low-cost devices that can be used to tap this resource, such as tube wells made of bamboo, but if energy – in the form of electric or diesel power – is not available, the wells cannot function. By that much, the opportunities for employment generation provided by multiple cropping will have been diminished.

Mixed farming, the combination of agriculture with the raising of livestock, has great potential in irrigated as well as rain-fed areas. It adds to the income of farmers with small holdings, and increases employment for landless labour. But mixed farming should not be introduced without adequate scientific investigation. For example, poultry farming should be encouraged only if there is a plentiful grain supply, since poultry consume large quantities of maize, sorghum, and other such cereals. On the other hand, the cow and the buffalo can digest cellulosic material that man cannot utilise. Thus, the relationship between the cow and the human being is complementary and not competitive. In China, scavenging animals like pigs have been used effectively in production systems based on the principle of recycling. The same principle can be adopted for pond fisheries, and highly productive systems developed, based upon the supply of the waste product of ducks and pigs. Such high-synergy systems have a multiplier effect on economic growth.

In July and August, eastern India and Bangladesh are often devastated by floods, and the Brahmaputra Valley is chronically flood prone. Food control is not always possible, and even when it is, it requires heavy investment. At present, the main crop in these areas is raised in the flood season, with the result that crops are often destroyed. With the help of surface irrigation and the use of underground water, the flood-free months could be converted into the main cropping season. Here again power is required.

Modern mechanised agriculture itself has become a major consumer of energy derived from non-renewable sources. It has been calculated that while India uses 286 kilocalories of energy to produce one kilogram of rice protein, affluent nations use 2,800 kilocalories to produce one kilogram of wheat protein and 65,000 kilocalories to produce one kilogram of beef protein. Obviously, the poorer countries should ensure that their agricultural growth is not entirely dependent on scarce, expensive, and pollution-generating forms of energy.

Developing countries that are now endowed with fossil fuels should try to achieve their agricultural goals by energy conservation and by recycling. This is the best way of ensuring growth that does not erode the long-term production potential. For a long time the Indian farmer was sceptical of modern agriculture, but in the last ten to twelve years he has adopted new methods with great alacrity and has taken to cultivating many new crops. Just as industrialisation everywhere has elbowed out traditional rural crafts, so with the advent of modern farming, the farmer is abandoning several excellent traditional practices. He tends to apply more chemical fertiliser than prudence and science would dictate. The farmer should be re-educated to use organic fertiliser – compost and green manure – along with the inorganic. The cheap and familiar is often far from useless.

The scarcity of pesticides may strike developing countries with even more severity than the shortage of fertilisers. Tropical conditions are particularly favourable to insects. A way out can be found in post-management procedures that are locally relevant. These may be based on pest avoidance rather than pest control, or on taking advantage of natural enmities within the insect world. Even if pesticides are plentiful, experience shows that insects soon become resistant to them. Farmers should be more judicious in their use of pesticides, learning the value of many insects and the importance of maintaining nature's balance.

Research can never end. Every agro-ecological milieu has its own problems, and new ones keep appearing. For example, during the south-west monsoon period in India, many soil nutrients are lost through leaching. This could be minimised by mixing fertiliser with margosa cake, derived from the seeds of the margosa tree. Such local solutions to local problems must be encouraged.

Even affluent countries must now conserve energy. Scientists and technologists have yet to develop commercially feasible methods of harnessing the energy of the sun, wind, and tides, but this work is attracting greater attention and several experiments are under way. Hitherto unused sources of natural power must be developed as quickly as possible to meet the needs of production and to assure remunerative employment to a fast growing population.

Growth Strategies and Resource Constraint

Human endeavour and organisational change will not alone compensate for deficiencies in nature or supply the material needs of modern agriculture. Systems that have used labour as a substitute for capital or technology have not escaped vast food deficits. This is demonstrated by the wide fluctuations in food production in the Soviet Union and China and their resultant recourse to large-scale imports from abroad.

In the last few years, developments in different parts of the world, especially in the matter of food, prompt reflection on the different theories of development that have been propounded from time to time. It has been said that some forms of government or constitutional framework promote faster growth than others; that excessive individualism, or concern with human rights and legal remedies, may act as a brake on economic progress; and that some governments and states can be characterised as 'soft states' with little prospect of rapid human improvement. The present economic crisis seems to belie such generalisations. Economic development is a complex process, and the reason that some economies grow faster than others cannot be found solely in the varying forms of government and institutions prevalent in different societies.

The adequacy of resources, and their efficient use, plays an important part in development. There are also random and uncontrollable factors, including the unpredictability of nature. Agricultural production is particularly vulnerable to such forces, and at one time or another almost all countries have had to face the consequences of fluctuations in food production on the economy as a whole. Discipline in society is as essential as a determined effort to augment production and secure its equitable distribution. The correct choice of priorities and technology is vital; and because resources are limited, the efforts of individual countries to achieve self-sufficiency in food must be supported by international action when unforeseen contingencies have to be met.

The existence of present deficiencies should not detract from the considerable progress in agricultural development that has already been achieved in several developing countries, including India. In contrast to the near-stagnation of the decades before India achieved independence in 1947, agricultural production, since planning began in the early 1950s, has maintained a long-term growth trend of about three and a half per cent annually. India is thus among the countries in which agricultural growth has been ahead of the growth in population, although not so much ahead as we would have liked to see. At the beginning of the 1950s, grain production was around fifty to fifty-five million metric tons; in the middle 1970s, it is in the neighbourhood of a hundred and five to a hundred and ten million metric tons. (See table at the end of the article.) In a matter of two decades, grain production in absolute terms has been doubled. In the early stages, most of the increase came about through the extension of cultivation, but as land became scarcer, reliance had to be placed on increasing production per hectare. The advent of new technology in the mid-1960s, with the introduction of high-yielding varieties of seed, and the massive application of fertiliser, along with many improved practices, has led to a significant transformation of agriculture in some parts of India, notably the north-west.

The Green Revolution: A Mixed Picture

For anyone with an adequate understanding of production processes in a country like India, with its widely divergent conditions, there was neither euphoria, nor subsequent disenchantment with the so-called Green Revolution. To adopt either attitude would be to oversimplify and to show that one was out of touch with reality.

In recent years, there have been sharp increases in the consumption of chemical fertilisers and pesticides, in minor irrigation, in the spread of improved varieties of seed, and in the provision of credit and marketing facilities. This tempo of progress must be sustained and extended to other parts of the country. In particular, attention is now being given to dry-farming techniques and to major irrigation schemes, along with intensive area development. The structure of production in rural society is of vital importance, and this is why land reforms are crucial to India's agricultural programme.

Planning and Technology

In the last twenty years, two million people have acquired title to land for the first time. Landless labourers are being given sites for homes and loans to build homes of their own. Ceilings have been placed on the total acreage that a person or a family can own, and the surplus is being distributed among the landless. There is considerable resistance to this from the bigger landowners, and the implementation of these programmes has been rather slow.

Just as, at the international level, the more advanced nations are in a better position to use science and technology for further advancement so, at our national level, we find that intensive farming methods, and the extension services of the agricultural universities, have benefited the comparatively well-off farmer, widening the gap between him and others in the rural community. To correct this imbalance, it is only fair that the new rural rich should contribute to rural uplift, since their prosperity is due to the input made available to them. Recently, we have launched special programmes to help marginal farmers and cultivators in dry areas.

In any drought-stricken area in India, a sudden or sharp drop in purchasing power is even more serious than the loss of crops. Even if enough food can be moved in from other parts of the country, few can afford to buy it. Hence we are compelled to start public works that will generate some income immediately and enable people to feed themselves rather than subsist on food doles. In 1965–6, when two successive monsoons failed in eastern India, we provided work for three million people. In 1971–2, when the rains by-passed Maharashtra, Gujarat, and Rajasthan in western India, nine and a half million people were employed on relief works. To have averted deaths during droughts of such magnitude is no mean achievement.

The increase in the production of grain and other crops has been uneven because of climatic variations from year to year. Even now, only about twenty-five per cent of our cultivated area is irrigated. In view of the shortage of funds, investment in irrigation has traditionally been of a protective nature. Only during the last few years has it been possible to provide resources for the full utilisation of available water through irrigation systems. With improved water management and the assured input of such things as fertiliser, it has been estimated that India could double its food production in the next fifteen years. Some developing countries have an even higher potential. In the current year it is unlikely that requirements will be met, even though we are giving the highest priority to fertiliser imports.

The world shortage of fertiliser is a major handicap to all developing countries in the medium term. Its maldistribution stems partly from variations in natural endowments, but mainly it is a result of the inability of the developing countries to invest adequately in fertiliser production. International action must be initiated to correct this. The world cannot risk the free play of market forces in such commodities, any more than it can in food supplies. Equitable distribution of the limited fertiliser available in the world should be an integral part of the world food security system.

Ensuring World Food Security

Recent experience also indicates that a world without want cannot come into being unless nations agree amongst themselves to create an emergency food reserve that can be used in times of need, and a world buffer stock of grain that can be used to level out fluctuations in food production and prices.

Hardly any,country is able to operate a free market system in so basic a commodity as grain. Price support is necessary to protect producers, and some control has to be exercised over stocks and distribution in the interests of the consumer. Difficulties arise, partly from the nature of the cycle of agricultural production, and partly because of the unequal distribution of income within each country. They are aggravated in those countries where the demand for food has been increasing faster than domestic supplies.

The world must think in terms not of free trade but of arrangements that will ensure the distribution of limited food supplies in accordance with some criterion of need, rather than solely on the basis of purchasing power. Such arrangements may involve an international system of voluntary contributions to a world buffer stock; alternatively, they could take the form of an agreement among nations to maintain a minimum level of stocks for times of scarcity in accordance with internationally-agreed rules. They imply national and international action to create adequate and efficient storage capacity, and a conscious decision to control consumption, when crops are good, in order to build adequate stocks for the future. This is especially necessary in the richer countries.

Any system of food security for the world would mean some sacrifice, some curtailment of current consumption, on the part of the developed countries. If they were to substitute direct use of grain, vegetables, and other foods for even one-third of their meat and poultry consumption, enough would be released to make up the potential world deficit in cereals. World demand for grain has gone up, not only because of the increasing population, and improved diets in the less developed countries, but also because of the changing consumption patterns within affluent countries. They have the means to pay for what they want and, in the process, the limited resources of the world are wasted and the really needy are deprived. Voluntary restraint, or the turning of enlightened enthusiasts to vegetarianism, would hardly make a dent. Eating habits and patterns of production must be guided by systematic fiscal and other governmental action, in order to influence the relative prices of different products.

Until recently there was no shortage of grain on a global scale; yet, from time to time, individual countries have faced acute shortages and have lacked the funds to import supplies from other regions. Within the poorer countries, the main brunt is borne by the weakest sections of the populace. Thus national policies are as important as international action. The entire philosophy of development – as it affects an individual nation and the world as a whole – has so far concentrated attention on problems of economic growth, and of ensuring relative rates of growth, that will reduce disparities among developing and developed countries. It is now generally realised that this approach to development is inadequate. The attack on poverty must be more direct, within nations as well as among nations. Such an approach involves massive redistribution of economic opportunities, and not merely transfers from rich to poor through bilateral trade or international aid programmes. It involves devising worldwide arrangements to assure the world's poor that technological progress will not be to their disadvantage, and that economic growth will be everywhere accompanied by social justice.

The Overpopulation Question

Underdevelopment, poverty, and hunger are often regarded as the consequences of a burgeoning population. Many in the affluent lands, reading at their breakfast table of starvation in Africa or Asia, are content to shrug their shoulders and blame it on the increase in numbers.

There is no question but that world population must be contained. Poorer countries have invested heavily in population control; the basic problem, however, is not one of money but of personnel, not one of method but of motivation. Couples do not decide the size of their families in terms of its effect on the *per capita* income of the nation, or on the world's food supply. What concerns them is the effect on their own standard of living. For educated, well-to-do parents, each new baby makes heavy demands on time and budget. For the really poor, an extra child makes hardly any difference. It may, in fact, be regarded as an earner and a helper.

India has the largest officially sponsored family-planning programme of any country; our birth rate has been coming down; though it varies sharply from state to state. It is lower where *per capita* incomes are high or where women have more education and wider interests. For the country as a whole, the birth rate has fallen from forty-one per thousand of population to thirty-seven in the last decade, but it is thirty in Kerala and Tamil Nadu, where education has made great headway, and three in the Punjab, where the increase in agricultural production has been tangible. Family planning cannot be viewed in isolation. It is a part of development.

Our increased population is not due entirely to new births. Thanks to our public health programmes, which have curbed, although not yet eradicated, several diseases, the life span of the average Indian has risen and the death rate, which was thirty-one per thousand of population in the 1930s, is now down to seventeen per thousand. We cannot rest on our laurels, however. We find, for instance, that mosquitoes have re-appeared and that the new strain is resistant to insecticides.

Considering the vast number of people involved, and the rising cost of modern medicine, we must place greater emphasis on the prevention of disease. Proper nutrition and sanitation are essential. So is education, especially of mothers. Some knowledge of elementary health care could prevent much illness. For example, almost four-fifths of blindness could be prevented by giving babies the vitamins so easily obtained from green vegetables.

We are encouraging a new approach to medical education and organisation so that health services are not concentrated around hospitals but reach out to village homes. Indigenous systems of medicine, the *Ayurvedic* and the *Unani*, have centuries of experience behind them. To give one example, the Sarpagandha plant has long been known as a cure for ailments of the heart and nervous system, but our modern doctors ignored it until it was rediscovered by the West and given a place in pharmacopoeias under the name 'reserpine'. We have descriptions of caesarean sections and plastic surgery as they were performed in ancient times, and of many efficacious rural remedies that should now be investigated scientifically. We have seen how the ancient Chinese practice of acupuncture has suddenly aroused worldwide interest. Even science is not immune to the dictates of dogma!

And this brings me to Education. I wonder if any contemporary society is satisfied with its educational system. The developing countries face special problems, however, for the colonial education structures, which most of them inherited, have proved wholly inadequate for the needs of a developing economy. We read that China has succeeded in overhauling its educational fabric by totally breaking with the past and by cutting itself off from the world for an entire generation. But it is not always possible, or even desirable, to do this.

In India there has been a phenomenal quantitative growth in education. The school population has increased from around twenty-three million to nearly ninety million in three decades, and the number of college students from three hundred thousand to three million. Several qualitative changes have also taken place – a new emphasis has been placed on science and engineering and on the building up of scientific research centres and national laboratories, some of which have earned international renown. Nonetheless, the large majority of our young people pass through the educational mill without acquiring the vocational skills they need to earn a living or, what is more important, the confidence and intellectual attributes that will enable them to face life.

An open and democratic society grants many rights to the individual; it also expects far more responsibility and maturity from him than does an authoritarian society. The number of our educated unemployed has grown, but many of them are unemployable. Everyone talks of the need for change, but most are afraid of, and resist, it. We are, indeed, witnessing a greater demand for vocational training, and more polytechnics and agricultural colleges are being established. We are advised that higher education should be restricted, but this raises a pertinent social question. For a great many years opportunities for higher education were confined to a privileged few. Should its doors be closed, just when other classes and sections of the population are able to avail themselves of it?

Experiments in education are being undertaken by individuals and organisations in many countries. I was especially interested to learn of UNESCO's educational work in some countries of Africa. But the basic issues of educational reform are often clouded over by a preoccupation with unemployment. The sole purpose of education is not to enable young people to get jobs, or even to know more, but to help them become better human beings, growing in awareness and compassion, so that they can grapple with the problems of today and be prepared for the challenges of tomorrow.

At the start, I referred to the remarkable progress made by science, and its demonstrated capacity to meet human requirements. How do we harness this creative potential for national and global purposes? Too often, scientific knowledge has been made subservient to national objectives, especially in the realms of energy and metallurgy. In medicine, there is a somewhat greater awareness of international responsibility. Certainly a wider pooling of experience and sharing in research in the fields of agriculture and nutrition is called for.

A consortium of technical experts drawn from different countries, disciplines, and organisations, could ensure that scientific programmes are based upon critical action–reaction analyses. There have been reports of changes in the global weather pattern. The variations we have experienced during the past few years are unfortunately to our disadvantage, and the position of the Sahelian zone of Africa is even worse. Thus there is little time to lose in initiating a new style of scientific endeavour based on international co-operation in order to eradicate hunger and poverty.

National Interests in a Shrinking World

No country can afford to take a narrow view of its own interests, since it has to live in a world that is closely interlinked. The richer regions cannot abdicate their concern. Prosperity for the few cannot be enjoyed in the midst of poverty for the many. It is not military confrontation alone that imperils world peace; inequality is just as much a danger. As Rabindranath Tagore once wrote, power has to be made secure not only against power but also against weakness. So the quest for an egalitarian society is not merely humanitarian. It is a practical necessity if the world order is to survive.

Perhaps we are still remote from a meaningful system of world taxation and the redistribution of wealth through such taxation, but international economic policy must at least aim at securing rapid growth in world income, greater equality of opportunity among the nations of the world, and a worldwide system of economic security, especially food security. In 1974 two major world congresses were held, one dealing with population and the other with food supply. These subjects are of vital importance for most developing countries. It is to be hoped that these congresses provided us with some insight into the thinking of those who have the power to help the less fortunate among their fellow human beings.

Whether one thinks in terms of geography, historical perspective, or cultural patterns, it seems as though Europe and North America have long regarded themselves as the hub of the world. Formerly, as far as they were concerned, Africa and Asia existed only to be used for their own purposes – and indeed this was the case for many long years. Colonialism has gone, but the attitude of self-importance continues. Interest is taken in our development, but the criteria they use to assess our progress are those of the contemporary trends in the affluent countries; their angle of vision is still based on their own interests and global strategy. They ignore the relevance of climate, of geographical compulsion and the forces of history, of centuries of national experience and civilisation.

When foreigners visit India, they profess shock at our poverty. They have no idea of the stupendous effort required for a nation of five hundred and sixty million (with such wide diversity and such different levels of development among regions) just to survive in this fast-changing and highly competitive world – to say nothing of advancing from one age into another, which is what we are trying to do. The living conditions of the people of India, and of other developing countries, should be compared not with conditions in the rich countries but with the state of affairs prevailing at the time of our liberation from colonial rule.

It is easy for rich nations to forget that they too had poverty not so long ago, and that pockets of poverty still exist in the midst of their plenty and extravagance. I write this with no thought of complaint or accusation, for I am only too conscious of the fact that similar disparity exists in my own country – and perhaps in other developing countries as well – between town and village. Those who live in cities tend to think that *they* are India and that the rural areas, where the vast majority of our people live, are on the periphery.

The pattern of growth that we have copied from the advanced countries, itself generates dissatisfaction. And this disquiet is most marked in those sections whose expectations are highest, such as the urban, educated middle classes and the skilled workers in the more sophisticated industries. In a way, the outlook of such groups is similar to that of the people of rich countries; a feeling that they alone matter and that the welfare of the huge numbers who live in villages is not important. Unless the minds of people are remoulded, and infused with comprehension of, and compassion for, the suffering of the many, progress itself will be unreal.

In the western world, political revolution followed the economic revolution, but here they are taking place simultaneously. When a giant heaves itself awake after centuries of sleep, much dust will be raised. When a country is aroused after generations of apathy, many types of evil will come to the surface. Today, our countries are in ferment. We must try to understand the primary forces behind the changes that are shaking our societies, instead of finding fault with the efforts governments are making to solve age-old problems, made vastly more

FOOD-GRAIN PRODUCTION IN INDIA

	1950–51	1971–72
	Grain (in 000,000 metric tons)	
Rice	22.05	43.07
Wheat	6.82	26.41
Maize	2.36	5.10
Millets	8.93	13.04
Other cereals	5.65	6.46
Pulses	9.20	11.09
Total	55.01	105.17
	1950–51	1973–74
Total cropped area	131.9 ha.	169 m. ha.
Gross irrigated area	22.560 m. ha.	45 m. ha.
Proportion of irrigated area to total	17%	27%
Use of nitrogenous fertilizer (N content)	55,000 metric tons	1,970,000 metric tons

complex by the new problems of growth and the effect of global cross currents.

I have written mostly about India, for that is where my own experience lies. By and large, similar situations exist in other developing countries although, because of India's greater size and population, every problem here assumes gigantic proportions. Developing countries do need assistance at various levels and in varying degrees, but equally they need deeper understanding of their aspirations and difficulties.

12

'The Modern World'

Keynote address to Commonwealth Heads of Government Conference, Kingston, Jamaica, 30 April 1975

Mr. Chairman, this is such a vast subject that it is a little difficult for me to know how to cover the entire ground in such a short time. I hope that the distinguished Presidents and Prime Ministers will forgive me if I merely touch on some points.

The most important factor since we last met is the emergence of the Arab people as a political force through their economic power. I am not going to dilate on this subject, because we all know how this has happened, and we know the reasons. It has also helped some sort of a Pan-Islamic movement in what most people call the Middle East, and we call West Asia, because we know that geographically it is a more correct expression. There is now far greater realism in the area itself, and in the approach of others, towards the problem. Many set positions have changed, largely under the pressure of the oil situation, and because of the Arab peoples' unity. There is also far greater African unity today despite certain problems and despite set-backs in some areas.

The other very significant factor is the collapse of Portuguese rule in Africa. We welcome the changes in Portugal which have made this development possible and which in turn were due to the national struggles of the people of these African countries. As you, Mr Chairman, so aptly described it, Africa has liberated Portugal. We welcome and greet the emergence of Mozambique and Guinea Bissau and, soon, of Angola. In this context, I should like to express our appreciation of the significant role played by President Kaunda and President Nyerere and other distinguished Heads of OAU.

But vestiges of colonialism continue in such parts of Southern Africa as Namibia and Zimbabwe. In spite of all the declarations that have been made, racialism still persists. There is no evidence of any sincere change in the domestic policy of the Union of South Africa. As this question is going to be discussed almost immediately afterwards, I shall not say more at this stage, except to add that dialogue with South Africa can have meaning only if it is accompanied by steps to assure the dignity and the democratic rights of its own people.

There is growing African solidarity on this question. Not only among Africans, but also among the non-aligned and other groups, there is a much greater feeling of togetherness on this question, which is bound to have an effect. While this struggle is on, we notice new forms of racialism, such as discrimination on a colour basis, in Europe, and in other parts of the world. I mention the non-aligned countries. But just as unity and greater cohesion amongst them were gaining strength, a cleavage has appeared between the oil-rich and the others; and I should also like to contrast the unity of African nations with the inability of Asian countries to co-ordinate their interests.

Another significant factor has been the change in South East Asia. I have seen, in the newspapers, that the Saigon Government has finally surrendered. It was a long and bitter struggle. I am sure that we should all like to send our greetings to the PRG.

This event indicates the failure of a policy, which was based on misconception and false assessment, and which led to intervention and the propping up of unrepresentative governments in these countries. This policy showed also a failure to appreciate the meaning of post-colonial nationalism. I say 'post-colonial' because in the USA there certainly was an earlier appreciation of nationalist movements. Before the war, especially, we in India received understanding from them, but after the war there was a change of attitude. They completely misjudged the calibre of a man like Ho Chi Minh and his fierce desire to mould the future of Vietnam in consonance with the genius of its people, and underestimated the determination and capacity of the Vietnamese people to withstand any pressure – even the mightiest military onslaught – in defence of their freedom.

Such assumptions are made far too easily and superficially in international affairs, and we find that we ourselves are victims of them. For example, almost every time that I am met by various foreign dignitaries or members of the foreign press, they ask me if we are being influenced by the Soviet Union. I would like to say that it is absolutely ridiculous to suggest that we are under Soviet, or any other, influence.

The USSR came to our support at the right time, at no cost to themselves, and it may have been the policy pursued by the USA which enabled them to do so.

Recent developments in Cambodia have similarly illustrated that the will of a nation cannot be thwarted by outside military intervention. In Laos, one hopes that a dialogue between the two sides will lead to reconciliation and the formation of a national government representing the wishes of the Laotian people.

It is interesting to note that the Soviet Union has hesitated to take advantage of the situation in South East Asia, as indeed of the economic crisis in Europe, as one might have expected it to do.

Now to the trends which emerge. The fear of a nuclear conflict has receded; there is a lessening of tension in many areas, and this has led to increased economic and scientific exchange and co-operation, but the hope of steady progress, which many of us who supported détente had wished for, has been deferred. We in India, as I think most of us around this table, welcome every step towards détente, but the overall détente and the compulsion to maintain open conflict leaves room to manoeuvre for positions of advantage, and this may not be in the interests of the smaller countries. Competitiveness and strategic rivalries have spread to other areas and have taken new forms. Although open confrontation has often been avoided, local conflict and tension have often been intensified.

Arms supplies to various nations fuel tensions. In Europe, the détente was partly a product of deterrence, a precarious mixture of fear and trust. The level of deterrence as well as its cost is getting higher. Vertical proliferation of conventional and nuclear arms is continuing; and this points to the need for an agreement upon lower levels of deterrence.

It was believed by my father that détente would be conducive to greater arms control, and to disarmament, and that the funds thus released would be made available for the uplifting of the poorer countries of the world. But the arms-control measures so far undertaken by the great powers are meant to preserve their overwhelming superiority in arms, whilst reducing the risk, as I said earlier, of certain types of confrontation. The economic aspect of disarmament, therefore, remains a distant dream.

In all this, however, medium and small powers do have a contribution to make. For their voices to carry greater weight, they must strengthen their own independence and self-reliance. Whatever the pressures they face, it is essential for them to assert their own interests.

The Commonwealth is essentially an association of small and medium nations. My father's vision of the Commonwealth was one of an interdependent world, and he had hoped that this would be a beginning which would gradually influence other countries in the same direction.

We, the member countries of the Commonwealth, are also members of the United Nations and of other world agencies. So the Commonwealth should work to strengthen the United Nations, although the big powers, it seems to us, have become less enthusiastic about it, because they feel that they cannot use it in the same manner as before. Of course, they now say that it is the poorer nations who are using it for their ends.

In international affairs, as in others, there has to be a spirit of compromise. Sometimes, by pushing too hard and making claims that are too large, we may jeopardise or delay the achievement of our objective. If I say this, it is not because we want to slow down, it is merely that we take a more practical approach. In showing a sense of responsibility in this respect, we do not wish to provide alibis for others who want to avoid taking such decisions or such action.

As far as India is concerned, there are many misconceptions. I referred to one a little earlier. Some may be genuine misunderstandings. Some, we feel, are deliberate. Our poverty is not new, it is a legacy of feudalism and colonialism and we have been struggling these last years against tremendous odds to lessen it and to remove the disparity which exists between different sections of our people. Great changes have taken place. I travel constantly, not only in the cities, but to remote tribal areas and villages. And I see a great change in the way the people look, in the way they dress, in what they eat, and in fact in what they demand, because today our major problem is that everybody wants more of everything. Just before coming here, I visited one of the worst drought-affected areas in the west of India. Here we organise what we call test-relief works, that is, we give work to people to provide them with purchasing power to buy grain and we have fair-price shops. Now, obviously, it is the poorest people who come to work and dig in the terrible heat, but of the thousands of people I saw, not one looked hungry or was unduly thin or was in any way pathetic looking; only two had torn clothes. So this shows that although we do have poverty, especially in the hilly tribal areas and so on, the change in these areas is quite significant.

We have laid special stress on agriculture. Our food production has risen from fifty-one million tons to one hundred and seven million tons and wheat production has quadrupled. We have built up our industry almost from scratch. We now have a diversified base of heavy industry and have also made progress in sophisticated industries, steel, machinery, electronics, and so on, and we have even emerged as an exporter of machinery.

Although we still do not have compulsory education for the simple reason that we just do not have enough school teachers or enough equipment, we have ninety million children in schools and about three million university students. The life span has lengthened by twenty years.

Although we have received help from outside, which we appreciate and welcome, the major burden of development has been borne, and must continue to be borne, by the Indian people themselves. This is because the total requirement is so vast that no help from outside can meet it, even marginally.

Although often misrepresented, our foreign policy has consistently been one of non-alignment. We have scrupulously endeavoured to avoid the rivalries of great powers. We feel that a country of our size and background cannot be in anybody's orbit.

I should like to say that we have no illusions of grandeur or hankering for big-power status. We feel that our industrial base, and the scientific progress which we have made, and which we are still making, are essential for our independence, not merely political independence but independence of judgment and action. Our scientific policy is solely directed towards gaining economic strength so that we can meet our own special problems of poverty and inequality, and I don't think that our technological advance constitutes a threat to anyone else.

I have mentioned in some detail what we are doing because all this advance has created special problems. The problem that we have within our country, can be seen on the international scene; to put it simply, the more science and technology there is, the greater the advantage for the better-off. Immediately, the gap between the rich and the poor widens. Even when we have a specific programme for, say, the tribal people, it is the better off amongst the tribes who take advantage of it, so that a gap is immediately created. When we introduced the new agricultural strategy, referred to as the Green Revolution, those who had only been slightly better off than the poorer farmers, became much richer. It produced a class of rich farmers, and this in turn led to tension between them and the farmers who did not have irrigated land and who, therefore, remained more or less where they were. On the international scene, the same thing is happening. Although science is universal, the better-off nations are able to use it to greater advantage, and therefore the gap, which science should have narrowed, is in fact continuing to widen.

Our policy has been to work for stability in our region, mainly through our own political unity and economic strength, but also through friendship with our neighbours. Many old disputes which were of long standing, some even dating from 1820, are being resolved one by one. Our aim is to seek friendship with all countries regardless of their attitude.

On the subcontinent, in spite of many difficulties, ups and downs, provocative statements, and so on, we have somehow managed to keep good relations. Of course, we have very good relations with my friend here, the President of Bangladesh; and also with Prime Minister Bandaranaika of Sri Lanka and with some other countries. Even with Pakistan, despite many difficulties, we are continuing a dialogue. There is an exchange of delegations between our two countries; we have had a trade agreement, an agreement over telecommunications and so on. But some of our initiatives have been unilateral, and have not brought forth any response from the other side. Such were our offers of non-aggression, disengagement, mutually accepted safeguards and so on.

There has been a lot of controversy over the lifting of the arms embargo. We do not think it would be fair to deny any people the right to be fully prepared for their own defence, but our experience has been that when arms are accumulated, this leads to tension. There is an accumulation of arms, not just in one country but in the entire region. So far as the lifting of the United States embargo is concerned, it is not the fact that it has been lifted or even the amount which matters, but the indication it gives of US policy. There is an entirely erroneous belief that this would contribute to stability on the subcontinent. We also feel that the timing was singularly unfortunate. It was done just at a moment when our own relations were improving with the United States as well as with Pakistan. There has been a setback, even though we tried to avoid one. It is not just a highly idealistic policy for us to say that we want to be friends with our neighbours, we feel that it is a practical necessity; we think that it is absolutely essential for a country like India to have stable neighbours. We share many common problems, and it is only if there is understanding and co-operation that each of us will gain strength and be more capable of dealing with them.

Well, what of the future? It is the inadequacy of the balance of power concept that has created this situation on the subcontinent and in other parts of the world. The idea that four, five, or six great powers, interacting amongst themselves, can preserve peace in the world, is an extension of the ideas developed in Europe in the nineteenth century. Such ideas have little relevance today for various reasons. For one, the world has become extremely complex due to the emergence of a large number of new states. Although, in orthodox power terms, these states are weak, they do have the capacity to upset any scheme of things which is imposed against their will. It seems to us that any approach to peace and stability, and any concept of a world order of the future, must be based on an understanding of the complex realities of the contemporary world, rather than on a nostalgic preference for the kind of stability which Europe enjoyed a century ago.

There is some speculation about the revival of an isolationist attitude in the United States. I do not think this is valid. The United States has deep-rooted conceptions of its own global responsibilities and has the instruments of policy for their implementation. The pressure on unacceptable regimes has not diminished, new bases are coming up. In this context, I would like to mention the resolution which Sri Lanka put forward in the United Nations with regard to peace and co-operation in the Indian Ocean, one that had the warm support of all the littoral states. It is not a question of what any one power does, but of the counter-moves it invites by doing it. We in India are against all foreign bases.

On the economic scene there has been a collapse of the post-war Bretton Woods System; there has been rapid inflation in almost every country; there were sharp rises in the price of food and fertiliser, which we discussed yesterday, and of course, later on, there was the rise in oil prices. All of this has had a great impact on the poorer countries, especially countries like India, which is somewhat in the middle. That is, we do need a certain amount of oil and fertiliser and we are not developed enough to be able to produce our own. We have found some off-shore oil but it is expensive to exploit, and this will take time and enormous resources. There is also a great shortage in the world of the equipment which is needed for this purpose.

Earlier it was said by the Communist countries that they were not affected by this inflation, but now they are acknowledging that European inflation has had an impact on their own economies; and it is going to hit them much harder because they fixed their prices for a number of years and so the change will not be gradual. What again is interesting is that one would have expected them to say 'This is the collapse of the system, this economic crisis has been caused by capitalism.' But in point of fact, they have not done so. Their criticism has been in a very low key for obvious reasons. They realise that instability in Europe is bound to have an effect on their own economies.

So far as the developing countries are concerned, in Africa as well as in Asia to some extent, this period of inflation, and higher prices, and shortage of essential commodities, has coincided with a period of severe drought over large areas. This has affected our whole planning process and it has certainly slowed down our development. In India, from about 1972, when we had a very bad drought throughout most of the country, up to 1974, the graph of prices was rising like the Himalayas. It was just a straight line going up and up and up. There were moments when we did not know how the country would survive. However, we took courage, and in July and August we adopted certain measures. At that time my own party and a lot of people felt that though these measures were necessary, the government could not possibly survive them and would have to go. But we felt that it was better for the government to do something that was necessary for the economy than to say 'Let us win the next elections and face whatever the future brings.' So we did take very, very, strong measures, thereby annoying every section of the people – the big industrialists, the big businessmen, the industrial workers, the farmers, housewives, every possible section. But we did it. I am sorry to say they continued to be annoyed but we did manage to curb inflation. These measures were taken in July and August and by September the upward curve had already stopped and from then on it came down, although not substantially. But the very fact that prices are not rising, but are coming down, is a very welcome sign and people appreciate it. Of course, it meant taking a very stiff line with industrial workers and dealing with strikes in a manner which has brought us a great deal of criticism from the ILO and other such international bodies; and we have been visited by delegations from Japan and other countries. However, except for saying that the strike was not in the national interest, we did not do anything that was illegal. Some of the accusations made against us, of torture and so on, are completely without foundation. But we had to suspend a number of workers during the railway strike. This strike took place at the worst period of the food shortage. Food could not reach the areas where grain was needed. Coal could not reach the industrial areas; there was tremendous hardship on the travelling public; we had no way out.

The situation all over the world has been greatly aggravated by the oil crisis. We fully sympathise with our Arab friends, because we know that raw materials have been purchased very cheaply for many years, and the profits have been made by the big oil companies and other such organisations, to the detriment of the producing countries. We fully understand, therefore, the position of the oil producing countries, but the fact remains that most of the money that they have made has flowed back to the highly industrialised countries in the form of investments, and in purchases of machinery and so on. Only a very, very, minute portion of it has come back to the developing countries. In spite of the hue-and-cry raised by the advanced countries, it is the poorer countries which have suffered most. The countries least affected by these adverse developments were the United States and the Soviet Union, with their continental, and largely self-sufficient, economies.

There have been some attempts at trying to find ways and means to help those countries which have been most affected. There have been excellent declarations by UNCTAD, and in Dakar, and elsewhere, but the gap between the perception of problems and the will to do anything about them has not in any way been bridged.

As Mr Manley said yesterday, most of these are global problems whether they concern the environment, or population or food. We do need a global response. We are going to have discussions on economic matters and on the EEC later. All I want to say now is that when the idea of the UK joining the EEC was first broached, we did not want in any way to discourage the UK because we felt that they should do what was in their best interests. But we did fear that the EEC would become another rich man's club. Fortunately, it is a little more outward-looking now. We have entered into commercial agreements with the EEC and we also have bilateral relations with member countries and I think that many other countries are doing the same.

We welcome the decisions of the Lome Convention in which the points of view of a number of Commonwealth countries have received some understanding. We would like to regard the Lome Convention as a precursor to similar arrangements with other regions.

Finally, I would like to say that the need today, more than ever before, is for co-operation. We now need interdependence between the advanced, the financially affluent and the developing countries. The Commonwealth can be not only a model for co-operation but a positive factor for new economic initiatives for the welfare of individual members of the Commonwealth. Political problems are important, but we find that they too are being more and more influenced by economic trends and economic demands and economic needs.

13

'The Meaning of Non-Alignment'

Address to the Conference of Heads of State/Governments of Non-Aligned Countries, Colombo, 16 August 1976

Madame President, Distinguished Heads of States and Governments, Comrades in our Common Quest:

As I stand on this tribune, before such a distinguished gathering of leaders, there is a feeling of exhilaration at the destiny which brings us together again. Since those early days just after the last World War, when we saw the first signs of freedom for our peoples, our long road has been arduous at times, yet resolute and purposeful as well. In 1947 the countries of Asia met for the first time, in New Delhi, to affirm their solidarity and proclaim their vision of the world they hoped to fashion. On that momentous occasion, Jawaharlal Nehru gave utterance to the ardent yearnings of the peoples of Asia, when he declared that they would no longer be petitioners in foreign chancelleries, nor pawns in anyone's games. He said, 'We propose to stand on our own legs and to co-operate with all others who are prepared to co-operate with us.' Taking the worldwide view of which our people are justly proud, he said, 'Asia stretches out her hand in friendship to Europe and America, as well as to our suffering brethren in Africa' . . . And he also said, 'Universal human freedom cannot be based on the supremacy of any particular class. It must be the freedom of the common man everywhere, providing him with every opportunity to develop.'

These were the first seeds of the concept we call non-alignment, seeds that germinated at the Bandung Conference and which grew firm roots in Belgrade. From Belgrade, through Cairo, Lusaka and Algiers, the non-aligned movement grew in strength and effectiveness. The present Conference marks a further advance of that vision, a vision that embraces the world. In a fast changing world, non-alignment remains the bulwark of an ever-widening area of peace, a shield against external pressure and a catalyst of a new economic order based on equality and justice. It promotes and hastens change, itself remaining unchanged. We represent nations which, in their colourful diversity, are united in their constant search for freedom, equality, peace and stability, not only for themselves but for the whole world. Non-alignment is the courage of true independence.

It is apt that having girdled the globe, this Conference should now return to our continent, to the verdant isle of Sri Lanka. I bring to you, Madam President, and to your people, the warm greetings of the Government and people of India. In convening this Conference in Colombo, we pay tribute to the steadfast and constructive role played by your gallant country in international affairs and within the non-aligned movement, first under its dynamic leader, Mr S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike, and now, under your able guidance. The friendship of India and Sri Lanka dates back several centuries and embraces a kinship enriched by the interaction of religion, culture, art and literature. Since we gained our freedom, it has been stimulated by mutual trust and co-operation.

I take this opportunity to thank our good friend, President Boumedienne of Algeria, for the energetic leadership he has provided in the furtherance of our objectives during the last three years.

It is a matter of gratification to have, amongst us, President Tito, one of the founding fathers of our movement, whose continuing guidance we value.

It gives me special pleasure to see amongst us a host of new leaders of triumphant liberation movements, and of pioneer nation-builders. We all extend a warm welcome to the representatives of Angola, Cape Verde, Comoros, the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Panama, Sao Tome and Principe, the Seychelles and the PLO. We note with particular satisfaction the presence of the delegation of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. We rejoice in the historic victory of the peoples of this part of Asia and in the re-unification of Vietnam.

The concept of non-alignment was shaped in the long years of our national struggle, long before the Cold War began and blocs were formed. The Cold War has now ended, but has its legacy? Colonial rule has almost gone, but have its consequences? Many of our nations remain politically vulnerable to external pressure. The attempt to undermine the power of nationalism and destroy political cohesion, to discredit and remove leaders and governments who symbolise independent thinking, and self-reliance, and to install more pliable individuals and parties, continues unabated. Economic exploitation persists in old and new garbs. So do the technological disparities and psychological complexes bred by colonialism. Instead of diminishing, military presences are increasing, and theories of imagined power vacuums are mooted to justify such action. All countries around the Indian Ocean, who wish this area to be a zone of peace, are perturbed by the establishment of bases and the intrusion of rivalries. The aim of the non-aligned movement is to reinforce the strength of each of our nations to measure up to such challenges. At the same time we stand for responsive co-operation. We are neither a bloc nor a Third World, but a part of this, our only world. The task of the Conference should be to fortify the defences of peace by enhancing friendship and reducing divisions and disparities.

The era of the Cold War proved the soundness of non-alignment as, perhaps, the only practical policy for the preservation of the newly-won independence of many countries. To us, choice between one military bloc or another seemed irrelevant and unreal. Our choice was between independence and dependence; whether to progress through co-operation or perish through confrontation. That most states which have achieved independence have joined the non-aligned family is a vindication of the conceptual validity of our movement.

It is important that we learn to understand the reasons for the success of our movement and that we conduct an appraisal of how to carry it forward. If, today, the non-aligned do constitute a force (albeit a moral one), it is because we represent a major dynamic of history. We stand for the inherent right of every nation, no matter how weak, to exist and progress, despite notions of ideological conformity and despite the inevitability of war as preached by the strong. We represent the spirit of co-operation. And our political assessments have proved more correct than the analyses of those who would try to enforce their own ideological obsessions. Non-alignment, with its politico-economic basis, has a more powerful appeal. But unity amongst ourselves is essential if our movement is to retain its utility. A united non-aligned group will contribute to the peace of the world and help to evolve a new economic order for the millions of the poor. A new international economic order can only be realised with the help of a cohesive political force which while recognising diversity, looks at the situation in terms that go beyond the mere technicalities of trade, finance and raw materials.

Unity will not only benefit our own countries, but nations and peoples everywhere. In the absence of a united front, our voices will go unheard and unheeded. Our summit should, therefore, preserve the integrity of our movement and show courage and determination in consolidating our unity through closer co-ordination and co-operation.

The very success of our movement has led to efforts to divide and weaken us, to dilute the political content, and to blunt the positive thrust, of our work. In recent months the non-aligned as a group, and as individuals, have faced a variety of pressures. There has been angry criticism of our concerted stand at the United Nations and other international forums, and attempts at the destabilisation of established governments, amounting even to subversion. These must be resisted. Non-aligned countries should strongly repudiate any foreign presence or external pressure. Domestic change should be decided by the people themselves, not dictated by the strategies and compulsions of others. In the process of gaining new adherents and sympathisers, we should not deviate from the basic philosophy which has given this movement its vigour and indeed its *raison d'être*.

The vitality, efficacy and achievements of the non-aligned movement have been due largely to its flexibility of action. Our deliberate rejection of bureaucratic methods and rigidity of procedures has allowed us to concentrate on our objectives, instead of procedural wrangles and jealousies.

Because we questioned the logic of the Cold War, it is natural that we should be glad of the efforts at *rapprochement*, cumulatively described as détente. The Helsinki Agreement is a welcome event. The present détente, limited in content and geographical scope though it is, must be consolidated and extended to the rest of our globe. How can détente in Europe endure if other parts of the world are ravaged by proxy wars and competitive infiltration? Détente should include respect for non-alignment by others. It cannot co-exist with the destabilisation of non-aligned states. Nor can it usher in real peace, without a serious attempt at total disarmament. Détente should result in an active co-existence and co-operation, in which blocs and spheres of influence become redundant.

The peace that was arranged after World War II did not hold because it totally ignored a vast part of mankind, the part which includes all our nations. In no compact for peace can our views be set aside merely because we are economically weak.

Neither balance of power, nor deterrence by terror, offer lasting solutions. Time and again, the human spirit has prevailed over military power. A small Asian nation has given yet another triumphant demonstration of the strength of the strengthless. Peace can be attained only be harnessing the co-operation of all nations. The non-aligned have always been allies of peace.

Emerging polycentrism has generated rivalries no less fierce than bipolar confrontations. We should be vigilant against attempts to split our movement, to violate its integrity or to introduce discords from outside. We should not allow such differences as may exist between some members on certain issues to affect our unity. With so many leaders, the Conference is too important to spend time on bilateral matters. There are risks when national goals completely supersede the collective purpose. India has always refrained from bringing up bilateral problems in the non-aligned, or any other, international forums. We should all continue to observe the salutary practice of keeping out of our discussions any problems that might dilute our solidarity. Internal problems should be dealt with, or resolved, through patient bilateral negotiations, insulated from external complications.

In the 1950s and 1960s, the rallying cry of the deprived peoples was independence. Today it should be self-reliance. As we seek a rightful place for ourselves in the contemporary world, and are occupied in building our economies with the help of new knowledge, our development is impeded by the disparities and frustrations of the old order. Our people are not, nor can we expect them to be, tolerant of the present *status quo* of dependence and inequality. The world must evolve a new equilibrium of equitable interdependence, in which the political independence, and the economic self-reliance of the weakest and smallest nations, are fully protected. It implies the creation of a degree of mutual dependence which is of mutual benefit, without loss of identity or sovereignty.

Since we last met in Algiers, there have been important developments in international economic relations. These have demonstrated that the possession of resources does not by itself match the advantage of possessing technology. It is only fair to demand a more just return for our commodities, but we cannot relax our efforts to reach higher levels of self-reliance. Technological progress is not the unthinking duplication of the patterns of life prevalent in affluent countries. Consumerism is no blessing to us. Our objective should be a level of technology which provides for the minimum material and cultural needs of our people and which will enable us to withstand threats to our freedom, political pressure and unfair economic deals. The development of human skills for harnessing material resources within a nation is helped by more purposive co-operation amongst nations. As non-aligned countries we have been tirelessly advocating friendships which rise above political blocs. As non-aligned developing countries we should promote greater economic co-operation between developed and developing countries, and discourage ideas of economic confrontation. The community of nations should jointly and peacefully achieve that elusive equation between global production and consumption that yields its rightful share to every nation.

The response of advanced countries to the compulsions of a new world economic order has so far been apathetic. Patchwork remedies are no substitute for genuine reform. We need a plan with a global perspective which will relate resources to human needs, and provide early warning of imbalance and disaster. Improved terms of trade and credit, easier access to markets, and better value for raw materials and industrial goods, are all essential for the securing of greater equity in the distribution of benefits. Co-operation between and among our fraternity will enhance our strength and further the dialogue with the economically stronger.

Since Algiers, we have been formulating programmes for co-operation amongst the non-aligned. It is now time to pool our resources and our experience. The focus should be on the scope of functional co-operation. The Non-aligned News Agency Pool is an example of our determination to be better informed about each other, not just on the political, but also on the economic level. I hope we shall evolve new ways of sharing our technological skills and resources as a means of gaining individual and collective strength, and that we shall finally break away from colonial legacies and values. For its part, India has offered economic and technical co-operation to many countries and has provided technical experts and training facilities.

We are confronted with challenge and opportunity. The challenge – to reinforce our basic unity and integrity, to rededicate ourselves to the principles that have served us so well. The opportunity – to achieve enduring peace and freedom for all – peace through détente, disarmament and co-operation, and freedom through development – by using our collective power and united will whilst maintaining our distinctive personalities.

Let non-alignment give a lead in true independence, in new ideals for a harmonious world society, in a new concept of human emancipation and in new designs for national progress.

Years ago Jawaharlal Nehru said:

The door is open and destiny beckons to all. There is no question of who wins and who loses, for we have to go forward together as comrades, and either we all win or we all go down together, but there is going to be no failure. We go forward to success.

14

'Grow Rather than Grab Things'

Address launching the World Conservation Strategy, New Delhi, 6 March 1980

The current interest in conservation is not a sentimental one, but the rediscovery of a truth well known to our ancient sages. The Indian tradition teaches that all forms of life – human, animal, and plant are so closely inter-linked that disturbance in one gives rise to imbalance in others.

Eight years ago, I ended my speech at the UN Conference on Human Environment in Stockholm, with a stanza from the 'Hymn to Earth' in the *Atharva Veda*. Today, I should like to begin my speech with it. I quote –

> 'What of thee I dig out, let that quickly grow over,
> Let me not hit thy vitals, or thy heart.'

This should guide our relationship with the Earth.

In spite of his sorties into space, man remains earthbound. For him the earth holds everything. So he is limited to the resources of the earth which we now know are irrenewable.

There is need for a systematic campaign to educate governments, political parties, students from pre-school age onwards and others, regarding the importance and relevance of conservation and the factors involved. Yet in our anxiety to conserve other forms of life, let us not contribute to the denigration of human beings. People can be taught to live in peace with nature and themselves only if they are assured of food, water, shelter and work.

We have entered a decade which is fraught with uncertainty. The recent UNCTAD and UNIDO Conferences did little to comfort us in our hope that the growing gap between the rich and poor nations would be narrowed. The technologically strong continue to believe that their very power gives them a prescriptive right to the world's resources. As is well known, a citizen in an advanced country consumes fifteen to twenty times more minerals and energy than a citizen of a poor country.

I have been criticial of the methods adopted by the industrialised countries, not because we are wiser but because we, who call ourselves developing, tend to imitate the developed countries and have not yet evolved a non-exploitative strategy of development. The need of the poor for a livelihood, the greed for quick profits on the part of middlemen, the demands of industry, and the shortsightedness of the administration, have created ecological problems. It is sad that even scientists, because of their collecting activities, have contributed to the disappearance of several species of orchid and other plants in our Himalayan foothills. The manner in which we are encroaching upon our forests and mountains, and are permitting the indiscriminate cutting down of beautiful and useful old trees, is alarming. In spite of the government of India's Forest Policy Resolution, we have lost large areas in the last thirty years. As a result, there has been soil erosion, floods, and the silting of reservoirs and rivers. Large tracts of land have become saline or alkaline. One of our immediate tasks is to restore the eco-systems of the Himalayas and other mountain ranges. Can we ensure that by the end of this century, the Himalayas will have the same kind of vegetation as prevailed at the beginning of the century?

Learned lectures on ecology, however, and the sanctity of trees, can have little meaning for vast numbers of our people unless we can guide them to other ways of financing their basic minimum needs. All those interested in implementing the World Conservation Strategy should give particular attention to technologies which can help to meet the daily needs of such people, especially in rural areas.

Towards the end of this decade, we in India shall have to provide the necessities of life for some eight hundred million people and five hundred million farm animals. This task has to be so accomplished as to enhance rather than diminish the productivity of land and water. At my suggestion, we established Land and Water Use Boards in our states, and I regret to say that their functioning is not effective and satisfactory.

It is necessary to reiterate the need to achieve economic growth and to develop the social well-being of people throughout the world, within the confines of a sustainable environmental resource base. Rapid economic development without ecological damage can be achieved only if conservation becomes a way of life with every man, woman and child. Such universal sensitivity will have to be accompanied by a capacity at government level to subject developmental projects to an impact analysis, based on principles of ecology, economics, employment generation and energy conservation. Only carefully designed government projects, together with action by the people, can take us to the goal to which we are rededicating ourselves today.

Conservation cannot remain the responsibility solely of the government. Official and voluntary agencies must work together to create greater awareness. An example comes to mind. Our cities and towns are growing. To provide bricks for houses and offices, brick-kilns are cropping up everywhere, using up fertile top-soil. Do the people who use the bricks – and do the brick-makers – know that it takes nature over a century to make one centimetre of top-soil? If the owners of houses were to realise this, it would soon be possible to prevent the haphazard digging of soil for bricks. Brick-making could be linked to the creation of permanent community assets, such as farm-ponds or water-channels, by careful siting of the kilns.

The lack of an integrated approach to pest control has led to the re-emergence of malaria. Inadequate co-operation between those in charge of agriculture and fisheries leads to difficulties in sustaining ancient practices, such as rice-cum-fish or prawn culture. Indiscriminate killing of snakes for their skins leaves no check on the increase of field rats. These are just a few instances.

We usually club together the words science and technology. But much technology is unscientific, for it is directed towards immediate consumption, and neglects long-term welfare. How long can civilisation endure on a basis of reckless exploitation? Nothing in life is wholly good or wholly bad, it all depends on how things are used and done. Many apparently beneficial projects have harmful consequences. If drainage is not properly planned, irrigation leads to salinity. Pesticides help create greater yields, but when used indiscriminately they damage fruit and vegetables. There should be more systematic education in regard to their application.

The Indian neem tree, once so popular and so useful both in sickness and in health, is now sadly neglected in our country, but it is being planted to bring greenery to what was once a desert area of Nigeria. There should be greater exchange of information among nations about suitable plants and practices.

I hope that the launching of a National Conservation Strategy today will be followed by vigorous efforts, all over our country, to design and promote simple programmes of eco-development, of educational and economic value to the local population. Programmes such as 'a tree for every child', 'nutrition gardens', forest farming, the raising of energy plantations, organic recycling through the conservation and use of all waste products and the harnessing of renewable forms of energy based on sunlight, wind and bio-gas are all potentially valuable mass movements, provided they are formulated thoughtfully and implemented with the involvement of the local population.

The literature prepared for the conference is interesting. The maps are particularly revealing. They show how man is eating himself out of hearth and home, indeed burning up the earth and himself.

Nature is beautifully balanced, and in it everything has its own place and special utility. Any disturbance creates a chain reaction which may not be visible for some time. Taking a fragmentary view of life has created global and national problems.

With the arrogance that comes from increasing knowledge and capacity, man has ignored his dependence on the earth and has lost his communion with it. He no longer puts his ear to the ground so that the earth can whisper its secrets to him. He has cut his links with the elements and has weakened resources which are the heritage of millions of years of evolution – all those living or inanimate things which sustained him and gave him inner energy – (earth, water, air, the flora and fauna). This diminishing of his intuitive response to nature had created a feeling of alienation within him, and it is destructive of his patrimony. So while we have to think of the conservation of the earth, and of helping those whose standards of living are too low, we also have to consider whether man himself is developing with something worthwhile.

The national song which inspired our freedom movement describes our land as one endowed with water and fruit, rich with the greenness of growing plants. This should be true not only of India but of all lands. Some people are said to have green fingers. The aim of the World Conservation Strategy should be to ensure that every man, woman and child on earth has fingers that will grow rather than grab things.

I welcome this initiative of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, the United Nations Environment Programme, the World Wild Life Fund, FAO, and UNESCO and have pleasure in launching the World Conservation Strategy in India.

15

‘Stimulate Economic Growth Without Damage to Ecological Harmony’

Address at Fifteenth Regional FAO Conference, New Delhi, 10 March 1980

Food is the very foundation of life. Today, with the help of industrial technology, we produce a myriad of things but food production must always remain our first concern. This concern has been expressed in the evolution, through the good offices of FAO, of the concept underlying the International Food Security System.

The realisation that man was born free but was everywhere in chains, led to the great revolutionary movements of the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The realisation that, while science has given us the power to feed all mankind, eight hundred million still live in hunger, must spur us on to new international arrangements to eliminate want. It is unfortunate that the recommendations of the World Food Conference of 1974 have made such little headway. The development and the developing seem to see the universe differently.

It is in this context that today’s Conference assumes significance. I welcome all the Ministers and other participants attending this Conference on behalf of the people in India who stand to benefit from your deliberations. Mr Director-General, I am glad to see you in our midst. You have been a friend of this country and of this region from the days when you represented FAO in New Delhi.

My colleague, the Agriculture Minister, has given a detailed account of the progress India has made in increasing food production, and of the many unfinished tasks that still call for attention. I shall address myself to some major issues of common concern to all of us – the need to stimulate economic growth without damage to ecological harmony, and the importance of employment generation and energy management.

The countries represented here contain more than half the world's population. The highest incidence of poverty also occurs in our part of the world. Our peoples are poor today but in the past the lands in which we live were often famous for their wealth. Because of their endowments of soil, water and minerals, their abundant year-round sunshine and, above all, the skill and drive of their people, they can be rich again. In the past, some of these resources were exploited for the benefit of others. But even after our liberation, we have squandered our assets. For example, most of the unique tropical rain forests of the region have been fast dwindling. While soil erosion attracts attention, because it is visible to the eye, the erosion of valuable genetic material, in the form of plants and animals, goes unnoticed.

Since the early 'fifties, the production of more food, and the diversification of rural employment, have formed the core of all our development plans. We have constructed dams and canals. Farmers have begun using pumps in huge numbers. Our extension agencies have popularised new farming practices. We have imported and distributed fertilisers and are now producing them in substantial quantities. We have built comprehensive credit and marketing systems. Land laws have given ownership rights to millions. Our scientists have evolved new plant varieties suitable for our soil and the variations in our climate. The combined result of all this is that our food production has gone up two and a half times. No longer are we subjected to the taunt that we, an agricultural country, have to seek food from outside.

But the battle is far from won. Hunger is far from vanquished. Many old problems persist. New ones have arisen from the very development that has taken place. The desire to profit out of poverty seems to be strong amongst the affluent nations and affluent sections of our own population. How else can we explain the enormous rise in the price of essential inputs, such as fertilisers, during the last year? How can the small farmer, who is too poor to buy these inputs, and too weak to take risks, afford these costs? I urge FAO to initiate a move for an international agreement on the limitation of the prices of strategic agricultural inputs so that they do not remain beyond the reach of the average farmer.

We have enlarged our rural credit system, but we have not been able to assist every farmer irrespective of the size of his holding. Those in charge of agricultural development programmes must find new ways of improving the economic well-being of the rural poor. In India we have been experimenting in a small way with crop and cattle insurance but we have not yet been able to develop mechanisms to protect farmers adequately from losses due to causes beyond their control.

What a farmer needs most is to be assured of his market and of remunerative prices. As more and more small farmers grow saleable products, they find that they are unable to get a reasonable return on their labour and investment. A small increase in output often causes a large drop in price. Conversely, small shortfalls in production lead to panic purchases by the well-to-do, thus disproportionately increasing prices to the consumer. Agricultural growth has to be coupled with stability of production, producer-oriented procurement, and consumer-oriented marketing.

Besides strengthening public agencies for procurement, we are also promoting the organisation of producers' and consumers' co-operatives. Our dairy sector has made dramatic progress largely because millions who own just a couple of cows or buffaloes have been brought into a chain of dairy co-operatives. If similar organisations of small fishermen are promoted, coastal communities will prosper. They can undertake the cultivation of prawns, oysters, mussels, eels, etcetera, and plant trees like casuarina, cashewnut and coconut along the sea coast. Such coastal shelter belts of economically useful plants would also help to minimise sea erosion and cyclone damage.

Although India has achieved comparative self-sufficiency in food, malnutrition is still prevalent, not because of lack of food in the market but because many people have no money in their pockets (and sometimes not even any pockets) to buy it. Hence the nutrition problem is basically one of providing employment. Agriculture's share of the work force is not likely to diminish during the 'eighties in spite of the impressive growth in our industry and its infrastructure. Out of a net addition to the labour force of about 6.7 million per year, as many as 5.3 million will have to be absorbed by agriculture and the unorganised rural sectors.

Solutions that suit one country do not necessarily suit another. The advanced countries have mechanised their farming. But India, and many other Asian countries, need employment-creating, rather than labour-saving, technology. This should be one of the aims of research. We must remember Mahatma Gandhi's warning that machinery should not 'help a few to ride on the backs of millions'.

There is an old saying 'Paddy and poverty go together'. I hope you will identify methods to sever this link and to help the rice farmers improve their income through subsidiary occupations. They can be taught to process every part of the rice plant into value-added material. Fortified rice straw can support a subsidiary occupation like animal husbandry. Rice-bran oil can be another source of income and the oil-free bran can be used for poultry feed. The introduction of additional crops, like pulses, oilseeds or jute, after the rice has been harvested, would add to income and employment.

The crucial question is that of energy management. Industry and agriculture both need vast amounts of energy in order to increase production, but oil, and coal, are becoming more costly and less easily available. The solution prescribed by some experts is to limit growth. Ironically, those who practise conspicuous consumption are teaching the virtues of thrift to us poor. Most countries represented here, obviously, cannot think of limiting economic growth at present. They are still struggling to provide the basic minimum needs of their people. Agriculture, fortunately, is a profession based on renewable forms of energy. Most crops are primarily a harvest of solar power. But the so-called modern farm technology leads to a growing dependence on chemicals extracted from fossil fuels. If we were to adopt techniques of organic recycling, on the other hand, there would be no limit to our agricultural growth.

Recycling is important for energy-deficient countries like ours. More recycling in affluent countries would be good for them and for the world. It has been estimated that in the United States of America about three hundred million trees could be saved every year if the quantity of waste paper recycled were trebled.

Until a few years ago our farmers were suspicious of anything unfamiliar. But once its rapidly acquired benefits have been proved, they take eagerly to the new. In 1966, when I first became Prime Minister, we initiated a high-yielding-variety programme in wheat, although we had hardly forty hectares of land under it. By 1971, the area under these new varieties had gone up to four million hectares! Wheat production doubled within six years. Obviously such a quantum leap in wheat production could only be achieved by the official programme becoming a farmers' movement.

Let us therefore convert the difficulties caused by the rising cost of petroleum products into an opportunity to expand the movement for energy conservation and recycling. No such event is an unmixed blessing or curse. It all depends upon how we meet our challenges. Countries in one part of the world should take full advantage of the benefits that derive from the increase in the price of petroleum products, namely, a sharp rise in the demand for natural rubber, jute, cotton and other fibres.

Even some of the developing countries are blessed with sudden wealth from the export of oil. Others have met with a degree of success on the food front. In order to roll back the tide of hunger and malnutrition, to raise levels of investment and production, to provide security for impoverished millions, and to give an earnest of our determination to help ourselves, we must pool our respective endowments and experience, and create an enduring machinery of powerful mutual partnership. How precisely this goal can be reached is the concern of everyone at this Conference. India will play its part in such an endeavour.

I have pleasure in inaugurating the Fifteenth Regional Conference of FAO for Asia and the Pacific, and I wish success to your deliberations.

16

'Taking an "All Round Attitude" to Science'

Interview to Anil Agarwal of *Nature Journal*, published in London, 15 May 1980

Discussions at the United Nations conference on 'Science and Technology for Development', held in Vienna last year, revealed that few Third World leaders take an active interest in the scientific and technological development of their nations, and that this is a constant complaint of their scientists. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi of India is an exception. She is directly in charge of Indian government science and technology, the atomic energy and space and electronics departments, and is also President of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR). In effect she is India's Minister of Science and Technology. Why with all her other duties as the chief executive of a state, should Mrs Gandhi take on a third role? Her reply is simple: 'Because the scientists think that it's important. They think that they are then much freer of the bureaucratic stranglehold.' This direct access to the top has made Indian scientists the envy of their counterparts in many Third World countries.

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi recently called a meeting of selected heads of scientific institutions to discuss the problems faced by Indian scientists. The government may soon issue a statement to scientists emphasising their role in national development. Mrs Gandhi herself has suggested that science and technology planning should be extended beyond the central government. She would like committees such as the National Committee on Science and Technology – the existing policy-making institution of the central government's Department of Science and Technology – to operate at state government and, if possible, district level. Young scientists, with suggestions for new uses of science and technology for development, could be included on these committees.

Environmental Problems

As well as her interest in the role of scientists in development, Mrs Gandhi also takes a keen interest in the related issue of the environment. She recently released the World Conservation strategy prepared by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, and called a private meeting of Indian ecologists to discuss environment. It is a concern she says she was born with. 'I happen to love the earth, and I have from childhood been concerned about the cutting down of trees. I sympathise with Bernard Shaw: when people asked him why he didn't keep flowers, he said, "I love children but I don't chop off their heads and keep them in my drawing room". That's the sort of outlook I have always had. The aesthetic point of view is very much there. Most urban life is uglification. To me, personally, this is the more serious aspect.

'Now we find that progress itself, and the use of science and technology, is creating its own pollution, which is very much worse. Just yesterday I read in *Time* magazine of this chemical that was sprayed in Vietnam and now all the children have been deformed, apart from the fathers being diseased. Now that is all part of pollution. We are completely dependent for our very survival on air and water. And if those are going to be dirty or polluted, then mankind cannot survive. Now I said somewhere that I don't know if it is important for man to survive or not. Presumably most people want him to survive, and they should, therefore, pay greater attention to it.'

In India there has been considerable interest in the extensive deforestation that has taken place in the Himalayas. There are two philosophies about its causes; one is that the pressure of a growing population is leading to deforestation, and the other is that an erroneous development strategy, which has failed to attack poverty, has also led to environmental problems.

According to Mrs Gandhi 'It is much easier to cut trees down than to grow them. This process started in a very, very, big way during the Second World War; people began thinking of forests as either a source of timber or as material for industry, the paper industry or whatever. That is destructive, whereas it is possible to have what is called forest farming or social forestry. When you make plans you don't think of every aspect. You think that these people are poor, they need jobs and you need certain supplies, so a proposal is made to combine the two.

Until a decade or so ago, nobody thought about the environment. I have just read in a health magazine that the effect of a programme such as bringing water to an arid area can bring disease to which the local people are not immune, if they don't take care. So it means that you have to be on your toes and keep looking at every side of the problem.' Indian scientists have sometimes failed to display this 'all round attitude', Mrs Gandhi complains.

In the Himalayan region of the state of Uttar Pradesh, local villagers have launched a unique movement against the state-government-sponsored auctions of vast tracts of forest. For several years they have prevented fellings by hugging the trees – hence, the movement's name: *Chipko Andolan*, the hugging movement. To what extent does Mrs Gandhi appreciate such a popular movement? 'Well, frankly, I don't know all the aims of the movement,' she replied diplomatically. 'But if it is that the trees should not be cut, I'm all for it.' But the movement is also concerned about poverty in the region. 'Naturally, anybody who lives in an economically backward country has to be concerned with that,' she argued. But emphasising the importance of trees in themselves, she added, 'cutting down trees has brought havoc, because it has increased drought and flooding. It has made vast areas much more difficult to live in.'

What about the energy needs of the very poor who subsist on fire wood? 'We are starting a massive tree planting programme,' she says. 'In it, we have stated that every aspect should be considered; food, for instance. Where fruit trees can be grown,we shall encourage them. Quick growing trees could finance the programme (and be used for fuel); longer growing trees are needed for other purposes. But, of course, you can use other things for fuel. Even in forests.'

She believes a more imaginative approach is needed for this problem. The Planning Commission is considering setting up a National Eco-development Corporation to assist local communities to commence extensive tree planting.

Oil and alternative energy

The energy problem is 'very serious for us just now', says Mrs Gandhi. An overwhelming proportion of India's export earnings are being used to import fuel and fertiliser, because of the increased price of oil. Future rises could make matters worse. 'Although we have oil,' explains the Indian Prime Minister, 'it is only lately that we have started trying to get it out, and even that is a very expensive process. (Most recent oil discoveries in India have been offshore.) Now we are experimenting with solar energy and wind energy; in some places it has been successful, but we haven't yet tried it on a large scale. We are trying everything possible, any new idea that comes along.'

But wouldn't the further spread of the energy-intensive 'green revolution' exacerbate the energy crisis? Indian farmers last year suffered a crippling diesel famine and their irrigation pumps remained dry just at a time when the country was witnessing the worst drought of this century. India had no choice but to adopt the green-revolution-type of agriculture, believes Mrs Gandhi. 'It was a time of acute grain shortage, and the question was how could we double the production of wheat. We went all out, and that is how we were able to survive, despite other droughts. It's true we went into diesel in a big way, we even converted our railways. So now we have to find other forms of energy.'

Commercially viable solar energy may soon be a reality which could make a big difference to India, believes Mrs Gandhi. But there have been arguments over imports of solar technology. The scientists at the state-owned Central Electronic Company, who have been co-ordinating India's R & D on solar cells, have manufactured solar-powered pumps with imported solar cells in collaboration with a US company. 'We are never opposed to importing anything we really need,' Mrs Gandhi says. 'What we have to ensure is that it doesn't hit our national interest in any way. But if we are making something in India, obviously it is better to use it, even if it is a little inferior. But if we don't have it and it is going to help the people, then we have never hesitated.'

The US federal budget for solar research in 1979 was alone more than the entire R & D budget of India in that year, I pointed out. 'The gap between the two efforts was so big that it was certainly very difficult for Third World scientists to keep up, and yet, our scientists are doing a very good job,' she replied. 'No, I don't think that the gap matters much. We are not competing with R & D in the West. It is much more important to have a solid base than just to have a very sophisticated superstructure, which is what Iran did. Even to be able to digest the knowledge that other countries are acquiring, you have to have a base. You can't have a base unless your scientists have the opportunity of experimenting with and trying out these things at every level. It has to be a mixture. If you feel there is something from outside that will help your scientists, then you should take it, provided that the country concerned is not going to use it as a foothold to influence other policies.'

The Indian Prime Minister believes in the need to conserve energy and respect old, culturally accepted, energy saving technologies. 'All the new houses,' she points out, 'are built for energy consumption. They are hot in summer and cold in winter, whereas the old houses are not. The ancient house, in which I was born and lived, contained no cement, so probably it was cheaper to build. It never leaked as far as I remember. But when this house came under the purview of the Jain Fund, they said: "Oh! the ceiling might fall on the children," because it was a children's home. So they got engineers and found it was only made out of bran and lime and various things of that kind; it was at least a hundred years old then. But it has not fallen down yet. So it is not just a question of new technology. There is much sense in what has been evolved over the years to suit the climate, the environment and our way of life. You can't keep it all, because our way of life has changed, but I think a lot of it can be adapted and made more efficient.'

Appropriate technology is important

In contrast to previous administrations, Mrs Gandhi has been described as a critic of small scale, village-oriented 'appropriate technology'. Did she think it was important? 'I think it is very important,' she replied immediately. But she added a note of caution: 'I don't think it excludes the other, I think that we have to have a mixture of cottage industry, village industry, small scale industry, medium industry and heavy industry. Without heavy industry we cannot keep our freedom because we would be completely dependent on other countries. But we certainly can't survive with heavy industry alone. We have to encourage things all along the line. For instance, the bullock cart. You would like the farmers to advance from the bullock cart, no doubt, but until we can advance, I would rather put tyres on the bullock cart than ignore it altogether.'

India is attaching a lot of importance to bio-gas plants, pointed out Mrs Gandhi. She admits, however, that they are acquired only by the rich farmers. 'I'm sorry to say this happens in every field, no matter what you do. Those with more power – even at the lowest level – are the ones who always come off best. With bio-gas, what has happened is that the poor person, who was getting his cowdung free, no longer gets it (since bio-gas plants were introduced), as it has become a commercial item. It's the same with wood, and with fishing. We introduced deep-sea fishing, and here I must say that I, at least, was aware of the problem from the very first discussion on buying trawlers. I said, 'Well, what are we going to do about the existing fishermen?' The others assured me that they would be assimilated, they would be trained and so on, and that all the area close to the shore would be theirs. But it has not happened and they have suffered.' What then can be done to ensure that the introduction of new science and technology does not worsen the lot of the poor? 'There is nothing much you can do about it,' answered Mrs Gandhi, 'except in instances of this kind, do something to help those who are being neglected.'

How can a developing country like India respond to the rapid advances in electronics which are bound to have such an enormous impact? 'In India, I would say that if a computer improves efficiency, we should get it. Where there is greater efficiency and greater production, that automatically makes for more employment. Even in farming, where agricultural production has gone up, it has not meant less people in work. More labourers are needed and they can be paid higher wages. I don't think that there is a basic conflict in any technology, providing it doesn't harm people's health, or affect the poor and their employment. If it doesn't function as it should, then you should change it.

The bureaucracy, in Mrs Gandhi's scheme, should play a major role in protecting the poor from the vagaries of modern technology. 'Now this is the difficulty with government action. A bureaucracy – even the best – likes to keep to a set path and if there is any tiny deviation, they feel the heavens will fall or something.'

North-South and South-South relations

The recent Brandt Commission report on North-South issues has voiced some of the beliefs of Third World leaders like Mrs Gandhi: that the economic development of the South is in the interest of the North, and that aid should, in part, be in the form of an international tax. But she says she hasn't yet read the report carefully. 'I have just flipped through the pages. Most of it depends on the Group B countries (UN language for western countries) and this is the trouble – the difficulty rather – because these are the countries that don't want to move. So where do we go from there?'

Can the developing countries get together to increase their bargaining position with the North? There is much talk in the UN, for instance, about technical co-operation amongst developing countries. 'This is what we are trying to do. This was our effort in the non-aligned movement,' she says. 'At each conference – Lusaka, Algiers, Colombo – we went further in that direction. The trouble is that we are very bad at propaganda, we just don't know how to sell ourselves, and the things that we are able to do in this country. When most people come to India they want to go and see the Taj, so that even if they do come here, they don't return with very much more knowledge.'

There were a number of examples, said Mrs Gandhi, where India had obtained a contract from another developing country only after a similar contract had been broken with a western country. Third World countries still look mainly to the West. For the developing country, she said, 'How much better it was, and how satisfied they were. They hadn't realised that (a) we could do the job and (b) because we ourselves came from a similar economy we knew and understood their difficulties, and what they were try to achieve, much better.'

Now that Indian companies have started operating in various Third World Countries, did the Indian Prime Minister think there was any way by which countries like Tanzania or Zambia could ensure that the commercial operations of Third World Companies led to increased self-reliance of the host countries, and not increased dependence, as happens where multinational corporations are concerned? 'Obviously, I would like them to grow, keeping the national interest in view,' she replied. 'The tendency, as you saw in the report on ITT, is for multinationals to think of profits first, and that everything else comes second or third. For the developing countries, joint ventures are a useful way of co-operation.

'As the Indian government restricts Indian companies in their investment of capital overseas, many operations abroad are indeed joint ventures, gained on the strength of Indian know-how.'

What will her own administration's policy be towards the multinationals? Contrary to some suggestions in the Indian Press that her government might become more receptive to multinational investment, Mrs Gandhi replied: 'Generally we are not for multinationals. It depends, however, if by multinationals, you mean only the very big concerns; if so, we would rather steer clear of them. But there are areas where you can't, like oil drilling. Or there are areas where it doesn't matter. Suppose they made Coca-Cola here – I have never even tasted it – I don't think it would matter much because it is controllable. You have to look at these things individually, but generally speaking we would rather not get involved with them.' Coca-Cola and IBM were the two leading western companies that had had to wind up their operations in India during former Prime Minister Desai's administration.

Finally, a word about nuclear technology. Did she, in any way, share the growing concern in the West about the feasibility and safety of nuclear technology? 'On the other hand,' she countered, 'in Sweden they voted for it.'

Mrs Gandhi has been a strong supporter of India's nuclear programme and its objective of achieving self-reliance. But she says 'I can't prophesy anything at this stage' as to whether India could achieve that self-reliance in the face of difficulties and delays in its nuclear programme. She did feel that India should put some, if not all, its efforts into achieving this aim. 'We are using it for agriculture and various other things.'

Mrs Gandhi did not know when India would receive deliveries of enriched uranium fuel from the US for the Tarapur Atomic Power Station. India has maintained that the US has to supply nuclear fuel under an agreement that came into force in 1963 and which cannot be altered unilaterally. She remains extremely critical of western efforts to restrict the spread of nuclear technology. 'It is a part of their attitude of not wishing to allow the developing to develop more. Once a country has the atom bomb, they are prepared to accept it, they don't mind,' she says, probably referring to western acquiescence over China's acquisition of the bomb. 'They don't even want us to have peaceful explosions, although we have made it very clear that we are not going to make bombs or stockpile any kind of nuclear armaments.'

The US administration announced last week that they were asking the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission to send two further shipments of nuclear fuel to India even though it has not signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The political sensitivity of the region, in view of events in Afghanistan, was cited as the reason.

17

'Environmental Protection has no Meaning to the World's Poor – Affluent Nations Know it but Don't Act'

Message to the First Global Conference on the Future in Toronto, New Delhi, 28 July 1980

In our century man can see and hear at the speed of light and move faster than sound. Knowledge, that once would have needed vast libraries to contain it, is now on discs that can be held in the palm of one's hand. The discoveries of molecular biology, as much as the development of weapons of destruction, have almost obliterated the line between life and non-life. Mind and memory are being stretched by the stupendous growth of computer technology.

But are human beings wiser or happier? Where are we going? Progress goes in only one direction, it ignores all side effects. Should we not pause to ponder on the fundamentals of our increasingly complex existence?

In any discussion of the future of mankind, we cannot afford to under-emphasise the state in which the vast majority lives in what is called the developing world. Despite the natural resources and traditional cultures of their lands, this huge segment of humanity is condemned to poverty. If these millions cannot be assured of their basic essentials, what meaning can a discussion of the protection of our environment, or of preserving the ecological balance, or of saving wild life, have for them? Can we ever hope to achieve a world free of tension if the greater proportion of humanity lives in want, while a small, affluent minority monopolises the benefits of modern technology?

The ancients in India perceived cosmic energy in its triple aspect of creation, preservation and destruction. Science has been used for technologies of destruction. It has also created new materials. The time has come to give more attention to skills of preservation. Concern with the future cannot be a form of reverse archaeology. We must discover the art of living with nature and growing with evolution. How long can we draw upon the exhaustible resources of the earth? Many new forms of energy await harnessing.

Action can only follow thought. We are imprisoned in the old thought processes, motivated by the same old greeds and desires. Plans of action will fructify only if our thinking breaks through these barriers and our vision stretches into the twenty-first century. The issues that affect Africa and Asia today, and will continue to do so for years to come, are well known and oft-debated. But the world is dominated by the developed affluent nations, who are aware of the world's great wrongs but do not act.

The First Global Conference on the Future deals with a fascinating subject. Thinking people everywhere will be interested in its conclusions. I send my greetings to its distinguished delegates.

18

'True Inter-Dependence'

Second Commonwealth Heads of Government Regional Meeting, New Delhi, 4 September 1980

It is a privilege to add my words of welcome to those which the President has already extended to the eminent leaders who have gathered here from two continents and from two oceans. I extend a special welcome to the new members of our group: the Solomon Islands, Tuvaru, Kiribati and Vanuatu.

This extended family makes us especially glad for it is largely India's evolution into a Republic that gave the Commonwealth its present form: that of a multi-racial group of nations with differing political systems, that has played a mediatory role of some importance at certain crucial moments.

I can remember another conference held in this city thirty-three years ago. Neither we, nor many of the other nations represented here today, were then free. But empires were retreating and freedom was in the air. My father, Jawaharlal Nehru, had assumed office in the interim transitional government. He considered it important to bring together leaders of other Asian countries. As he put it, a watershed of human history was achieved when Asia, after centuries of subjugation, began to emerge into freedom and to assume its rightful place with other continents. Even then, having scanned the far horizon, he was prepared to welcome Australia and New Zealand as observers, for he realised the commonality of many problems in the Pacific and South East Asia, and saw the need for wider co-operation in finding solutions to them.

The various aspects of 'functional co-operation' are enumerated in our agenda. Australia, to whose Prime Minister we owe the impetus of the CHOGRM movement, has presented a thoughtful document on the possibilities of regional co-operation. I hope that our deliberations will also lead to greater give-and-take in assuring fair prices for raw materials, in industrial development, in the lowering of tariff barriers, and in the transfer of technology and the sharing of experience and training facilities. We are particularly conscious of the special problems of the island economies and of the least developed countries.

I should like to repeat another of my father's sentiments which I fully endorse. 'In this conference, and in this work, there are no leaders and no followers. We meet on an equal basis.' Without such equality, not only the substance of freedom, but the world's very survival, is threatened. Insistence on predominance has wrought havoc enough. It has led to the carving out of spheres of influence and to the balances of power which hold peace to ransom. Professed ideologies may differ but pursuits of power seem to be similar.

We believe in true inter-dependence. But this has no meaning unless there is a mutuality of interest. Such mutuality of interest between different nations and peoples which an inter-dependent world demands can be achieved only when we succeed in establishing a new world order based on justice and equality. But the omens for the realisation of such a new world order are discouraging. The affluent seem reluctant to make even the small adjustments which would make all the difference to us and which can hardly be regarded as sacrifices for them. We seldom get fair prices for our raw materials. Technology marches on, opening up fascinating vistas. But we still cannot advance towards them, because at every step, we are hampered by restrictive practices. As a result, the gap between the standards of living of the rich and the poor nations is widening. On the other hand, each passing day sharpens our people's own expectations. Development is a promise of material and social well-being. How can we persuade people to wait for the fulfilment of even their basic needs, to say nothing of their just aspirations to a fuller life?

Grave and basic structural imbalances have developed in the global economy. A special session of the United Nations is currently devoting its attention to this question. We can only hope that there will be an earnest North-South dialogue which will come to terms with the root cause of our ills. The Brandt Commission, of which our distinguished friend, the Commonwealth Secretary-General, was a member, has had the mortification of seeing its report pushed aside by the countries of the North, even though the findings of this Commission were confirmed in substance by the report of the Commonwealth experts.

Oil has become the major focus of tension. It has added to the burdens of developing countries, vastly aggravating our task of reconstruction. More than three-quarters of what India earns from exports, in none too favourable an international market, goes on importing petroleum and petroleum products.

But the oil crisis has also affected the advanced and affluent countries who consume a disproportionate share of this dwindling resource. Their obsessive concern with ensuring ever-growing supplies of oil has had an adverse impact on international relations. It has led to a military build-up in our region and added to the tensions. To me it seems imperative that an international conference be called by the producers to work out a scheme by which all consumers, big and small, are assured their necessary supplies. Obviously, preferential treatment should be given to the needs of countries which are most seriously affected.

A common concern for peace, understanding and development has brought us together. But the outlook for peace has deteriorated and we see uncertainty all around. The decade of the ’eighties has begun ominously. The colliding interests of powerful nations has imperilled the stability and peaceful development of countries in our own vicinity. No part of the globe is remote. No country can feel sheltered from these strategic conflicts, no country is beyond the reach of the flames of war. When the strongest feel insecure, what can we say of the security of countries like ours?

The crisis in Afghanistan continues unabated. We are against any kind of interference in the affairs of others. But partisan postures or impromptu get-togethers are no substitute for statesmanship in solving these complex problems, with their far reaching repercussions. No single power can claim a monopoly of wisdom or moral superiority. To condemn intervention in one place, while tolerating it in another, does not carry conviction. Fortunately there is increasing awareness of the need for a political solution in which all legitimate security concerns are taken into account.

South East Asia has been an arena of battle and is still in turmoil, because the interests of the great powers are in conflict. We have always believed that each nation in the region must preserve its personality and relate its interests to the welfare of the whole region. Alliances produce counter alliances. India’s viewpoint may be different from those of some others here, but we hope that our sincere efforts to promote understanding in the region will eventually bear fruit.

The ocean has brought conquerors to India in the past. Today it is churning with danger. Even the Pacific hardly lives up to its name. The frantically increasing pace of militarisation in the Indian Ocean makes the 3,500 miles of our coast more vulnerable. How can we acquiesce in any theory which tries to justify such a threat to our security, or which condones the existence of foreign bases and cruising fleets so close to our shores? Independence implies the responsibility of deciding what is good and safe for ourselves and of charting our own course. Any conflict between the big powers in our oceans or our neighbourhood will hit us hard. All this tension has built up because of the collapse of détente and the resultant renewal of the Cold War in all its severity. Great powers have great responsibilities. It is up to them to turn away from the pursuit of power, which is in any case illusory, to return to the negotiating table, and to come to an understanding to dismantle the apparatus of confrontation. They can, thereby, make a decisive contribution to the reduction of tension and setting the world on the path of peace and progress. Cannot this Commonwealth build a bridge of understanding between them? Let us work together to harvest our oceans for the benefit of our own people, and develop the riches of the open sea for the welfare of all mankind.

Whether we like it or not, the problems of the future compel our attention, for they are already upon us. There are many aspects of the human condition which trouble thoughtful people. The crisis that we face goes far beyond political and economic rivalries. It is a crisis of the spirit. For the first time in the story of our world, the human species and the values of its civilisation, which enabled it to rise above its circumstances, are threatened, because we have lost sight of the vision of our ancient sages and are obsessed with our immediate grievances.

If we in India are impatient to solve today's problems, it is not, I feel sure, only because of their significance to us here and now, it is because the sooner we get them out of the way, the sooner shall we be able to get down to what is of deeper and more lasting consequence. Marvellous knowledge is being unfolded by adventurous minds, never daunted, forever seeking. We must all combine to make the maximum use of it, to help man to rise above himself to a new stage of evolution.

19

'Science Must be not a Follower but a Pace Setter'

Inaugural speech at the Golden Jubilee
celebrations of the National Academy of
Sciences, Allahabad, 23 October 1980

I am indeed honoured and delighted to take part in the Golden Jubilee of this Academy which is one of our three premier organisations of scientists and one that has been connected with such celebrated scholars as Meghanad Saha and Birbal Sahni. It is a matter of special gladness that one of its founders, Professor N. R. Dhar is with us today. Knowledge is one asset that never depreciates. Professor Dhar is a symbol of that truth. To him, and to all members of the Academy, I give my greetings.

What a relief that this Academy was born before the rush to Delhi began. It reminds us of the old days when Allahabad loomed large in the intellectual landscape of India. We have always felt that nature meant Allahabad to be important. For millennia, Prayag has been a hallowed spot for people from all parts of our country. Ancient civilisations mostly grew on river banks and the meeting places of great rivers have always attracted pilgrimage and commerce. During British rule, apart from the three Presidency towns, Lahore and Allahabad were regarded as India's most important cities. The earliest universities, and the High Courts, other than those of Bombay, Calcutta and Madras, were located in Allahabad and Lahore. This city made its own very special contribution to our freedom movement. For two exciting, exacting and eventful decades, the main office of the Indian National Congress, the centre of decision making, was here.

I had better not say more about Allahabad, lest I be accused of partiality. But coming here is a very nostalgic experience. Familiar faces and familiar crowds bring back memories. Can we hope that

Allahabad will aspire to a future no less glorious than its past?

In this city of confluence, and at a forum like this, what could be more appropriate than to speak about the confluence between science and government? Each in its own separate way is a repository of power and instrument of change. Whatever ideology or system of government any contemporary society follows, it has to give the most careful attention to what Einstein called the 'sensible use of science'. This is one of the major problems of modern government. Carlyle once said that if history had long been the root of science, then, in the future, science would be the root of history. This has been borne out in the last century.

Planned support for science has been one of the major characteristics of governmental policy in independent India. Jawaharlal Nehru recognised that change in material conditions and in the means of production could only be brought about through scientific research and development. Science, to him, was the Bow of Shiva with which to vanquish poverty. I do not have to recount the various steps that were taken to build a chain of national laboratories, and centres of research and advanced technological training, and the efforts that were made to integrate science into our planning process. The intention was not to bring science under the State. But the State had to step in because our universities, even though they had produced individual scientists of outstanding ability and brilliance, did not have the resources for the investigation of problems, and the prepartion of projects, of social relevance. Like British universities, our own were dominated by the literary tradition, and practised what Medawar called 'a conscious and inexplicably self-righteous disengagement from the pressures of necessity and use.' At the same time we did not have the industrial base which fostered applied research in Britain. (In any case, industry usually sponsors research primarily to maximise profit!) In addition, because there were no foundations for specialised problem-oriented research, we had to create a large body of scientists and technologists to give us the sinews of self-reliance. This policy has paid dividends, in as much as today we can claim to have men who can handle the nation's technological challenges, even if the tangible return is not fully proportionate to the investment. It may be that, in the process, our universities have been weakened. The time has come once again to strengthen science in our universities, without in any way depreciating our specialised laboratories.

Research today requires vast quantities of sophisticated equipment. The days when Rutherford's laboratory could make do with an annual grant of £2,500, or C. V. Raman could discover the secrets of light with a few gems and crystals, have gone never to return. The capital-intensity of sophisticated science brings government into the administration of science in a big way. In the words of Sir Solly Zuckerman, 'Science has now become so great a force in society that it has to be planned. This is on account of its size and cost, and the need to manage it efficiently and wisely.' In every nation, scientists are invading government in large numbers. Sir Winston Churchill believed that scientists should be not on top but on tap. Nonetheless, more and more official agencies and institutions, which involve science and technology, are being placed under scientists. This is as it should be and this is our policy too.

But scientists are also human. It is sad but true that they often contract the bureaucratic bacillus of rank-consciousness and develop intolerance of the alternative approach. This is not the spirit of science. Science needs constant interchange, and scientists should be allowed to express themselves freely and frequently on the objectives and priorities of scientific work and national development. Problems of the field must continuously be fed back to the laboratories. My father constantly spoke of the scientific temper. Scientists should educate other citizens in the implications of science and technology, and collectively, through organisations such as this Academy, they should engage in a constructive dialogue with government. Instead of scientists seeking directives *from* government, we should expect to see ideas flowing from them (and from academics generally) *to* government.

Energy is the urgent need today. Immediate work must be undertaken to provide it from renewable resources. A continuing problem is that of reducing drudgery and bringing economic prosperity to our rural areas. Agricultural research and numerous inventions and processes have increased productivity and enhanced the well-being of our farmers. In medicine and public health, research and organisation must be devoted to the effective eradication of a whole range of diseases, especially water-borne disorders. I am told it is now feasible to wipe out leprosy and to prevent or cure at least fifteen per cent of blindness. Isn't it worth making the effort to do so?

An eminent physicist speaks of 'the fundamental oneness displayed at the microscopic level of physics, where all phenomena are interrelated, and cannot be viewed as autonomous and isolated events or processes.' I am stating this merely to reiterate my favourite theme that life is one and cannot be divided up into compartments. Hence science cannot be confined to laboratories or universities, but must be a part of education, of health, and of all aspects of development; as of life in the home, in the field and in the factory. Science must not be a follower but a pace setter, must not merely react to problems but anticipate them. It must be our support in meeting challenges; our tool in peace and our weapon in war.

Through the centuries, as discovery after discovery revealed new knowledge, science remained largely dogmatic and deterministic, believing in the visible and the felt. Relativity and the quantum theory shook the very foundations of that belief. Here in Prayag, a centre of learning, ancient and modern, it is fascinating to see that present-day science is now coming to terms with ancient philosophy. In recent years a number of books have appeared by scientists and others that have noted the similarity between the concepts of contemporary physics and the essence of eastern mysticism. Dr Capra, a research physicist currently lecturing at the University of California, writes: 'Modern physics has shown us that movement and rhythm are essential properties of matter, that all matter whether here on Earth or in outer space, is involved in a continual cosmic dance.' And this he likens to the dance of Shiva, 'The eternal life-death rhythm which goes on in endless cycles, not fundamental but illusory and ever-changing.'

Once again I give my good wishes to the members of the National Academy of Sciences and have great pleasure in inaugurating its golden jubilee celebrations.

My greetings to all citizens of Allahabad.

20

'Commission on Alternative Energy to be set up'

Address to Indian Science Congress, Varanasi, 8 January 1981

This year's theme for the Indian Science Congress is after my own heart and one with which I have long been concerned. It is appropriate that you should meet in this ancient city of learning. The Ganga and Varanasi have long been symbols of continuity in nature and in man's mental and moral quest.

For us who live in underdeveloped countries and who grapple with the age-old problems of poverty, the conservation of the environment cannot be at the cost of development. War at one end, and poverty at the other, are the worst of all forms of pollution. We need balanced development, and peace, to rescue civilisation from this predicament. The ecology movement must proceed hand in hand with the movement for peace and the fight against economic backwardness.

At the time of our independence, and in the 'fifties, we all looked forward to a brave bright new world. We had unbounded faith in science and the miracles it would work to eradicate the ills of society. But now we realise the truth of ancient wisdom: what really counts is the human spirit and the human approach, in science, as in everything else. Let us not blame science which has unveiled for us some of the mysteries of our own minds and bodies, no less than of the miracle of outer space. Let us blame ourselves, as governments and citizens, for seizing these wondrous opportunities not to help our fellow men, but to destroy or maim him, not to make up whatever deficiency there might be on our earth, but to deplete its treasures. For what? For very temporary gain, or physical comfort, or goods of which we soon tire, as does a child with a surfeit of toys.

The rich out of greed, and the poor out of need, have been reckless in plundering the earth's assets. There is now deep anxiety about the rapid diminishing of what has become essential to our way of living, even to life itself.

In affluent nations, agriculture is based on high energy inputs which we simply cannot afford. Agriculture is a harvest of sunshine, a resource of which we have plenty. Whereas industry makes allowance for the depreciation of its assets, this is not feasible in agriculture. We have to use land and water so as to enhance their productivity. The indiscriminate use of fertiliser, pesticides and other agricultural inputs causes long-term damage to human and animal alike, as well as to crops and to the earth itself.

Industry, so necessary for employment and for providing the things we need, can also be a nuisance. While vast numbers in the developing countries are in desperate need of basic necessities, the affluent countries are using up far more than their share of the world's resources, spending much money, material and talent in churning out luxuries and inculcating wasteful habits, even though it is now known that resources are limited. Goods and weapons soon become obsolete. They clutter our landscape. Either we cannot make, or have not yet made, the effort to recycle them. Factories pollute air and water, and cause as much dirt and disease as poverty.

Development with conservation means that growth can be achieved without sacrificing the needs of tomorrow for the compulsive needs of today. It requires closer associations with scientists and technologists during the planning phase. Planners ought to call for ecological impact statements to indicate the probable long-term effects of any technological innovation. We have just constituted a Department of Environment at the centre and have suggested to the state governments to do likewise. We hope that every major development ministry will have advisers to take care of environmental considerations.

Laws we have recently enacted ensure that proposals to convert areas of forestry to other uses are scrutinised by a central team of experts. Public awakening to the ecological dimension of development has resulted in an in-depth look at the Silent Valley and other projects. We expect the State Governments to share our concern and do their utmost not only to preserve existing forests but to extend and enrich them and promote socially useful schemes such as farm-forestry and social-forestry.

Poverty and economic backwardness are themselves constraints upon growth. To make rapid progress we need sophisticated technology, but change is bound to affect employment and temporarily dislocate the industrial labour force – although I am assured by people in industrialised countries that change of this kind is the only way to provide greater employment in the long run. We must ensure a continuous programme of training so that the hardship is minimised in terms of time and earning.

The real difficulty arises with certain traditional occupations in which large numbers of women in urban and rural areas are employed. As living habits change, they are forced into work for which they are not equipped. Equally serious, in more ways than one, is the condition of craftsmen and artisans because their skills constitute the wealth of our culture, and are living links with our past. They are creators of a type of beauty and quality which the machine can never reproduce.

We have about two and a half million scientists, one hundred and twenty universities, five I.T.T.s, one hundred and fifty engineering colleges, three hundred and fifty polytechnics and one hundred medical colleges. To this are added about a hundred and fifty thousand qualified scientific and technical personnel every year. To my dismay I learn that some three hundred thousand scientists and technologists are unemployed. We must not allow this valuable resource to be wasted. Ways must be devised of channelling this talent into new programmes to benefit our country-side. We should also organise groups of science students in every university to take part in local development, and particularly to help farmers and others with energy renewal and organic recycling. Many could later find occupations in agriculture, horticulture, animal husbandry, fisheries and forestry, or small and village industries and various aspects of post-harvest technology. Groups of educated young people should be enabled to organise rural enterprises. The merit of such group self-employment is that different members of the group can be trained in specialised but complementary aspects of the production-consumption chain.

Our people, be they literate or illiterate, have demonstrated their willingness to accept new technology once they are convinced of its economic soundness and social benefit. I cannot forget that some experts predicted that after 1974 India would starve without the aid of benevolent outsiders. That was the year when co-operation between our farmers and scientists increased wheat production. It is now nearly three hundred per cent more than in 1967. Every forward step in development, however, creates new problems. Many of these can be anticipated by scientists, and remedies taken to ward off or minimise maladies.

Better-off farmers may be more vociferous but even small and marginal farmers and share-croppers have a marketable surplus in areas where development has taken place. In the interior, and the hill country, farmers do not even get fifteen per cent of the price to the consumer for their products. This is why we need organisations to protect the interests of producers and consumers. Technology-based co-operatives have proved successful in many areas where professional skill has been combined with action by the people. The community of scientists and technologists can and must help the weaker sections of our population. Technology must be transferred from the laboratory to the field and workshop, and new ideas in marketing must be introduced at the same time.

A crucial factor in technological development is energy. Other countries are experimenting in a big way in the use of renewable sources of energy. In the long run, hydro electric power, solar energy and bio-gas will be the principal forms of energy used in our country. The tapping of solar energy through the three known methods of photosynthesis, the photovoltaic system and the photothermal application, could meet our needs. We also have nuclear energy which has other developmental purposes. In the immediate future, however, we must be very thrifty in our use not only of indigenous and imported petroleum products, but even of coal. We have decided to establish a Commission for Alternative Energy to advise us on energy policy and to draw up and implement programmes on alternative sources. This will give fresh impetus to innovative thinking.

Bio-energy, through the extensive use of community bio-gas plants, village wood lots and organic recycling, presents a vast panorama of opportunities in our rural areas. We should not underestimate the pivotal role of these renewable sources of energy in improving agricultural and industrial production, as well as in generating greater employment. In 1976, here in UP, the State Bank had planned to finance at least one gobar gas plant in every village. Such efforts should be revived and given priority. It is important to involve the local population through demonstration, education and organisation.

The success or failure of any technological innovation depends on economic considerations. The main reason for the gap between knowledge gathered in our laboratories and its application by industry, is inadequate interaction between technologists and economists. I want closer collaboration between scientists and social scientists. Social scientists should be inducted into our major applied-research laboratories, so that the socio-economic aspects of technology-transfer are fully investigated at the same time. If laboratories and universities were to assess the value of their work in the light of considerations relating to ecology, economics, employment generation and energy conservation, it would help to promote development and conservation together.

In the last few months, we have made strenuous efforts to dispel the clouds that have descended on the scientific horizon, in the universities and national laboratories. I have always attached importance to planning and to the purposive use of science and technology as an instrument of development. Professor Nurul Hasan and I have held extensive consultations with scientists in different organisations all over the country. When it is finally adopted, I hope the Sixth Plan will reflect many of the ideas you have put forward. We shall continue to meet not only the recognised and established leaders of science, but also younger scientists. Some of the most creative ideas in science come from people in their twenties and thirties. We must attempt a quantum leap in basic, relevant research and its application. Even advanced countries are fast realising that any diminution in their basic research will erode their technological lead.

I have tried to give a sharper focus to our programmes of scientific research, and have tried to inject more science into development and to promote the involvement of scientists in decision-making. Special attention has to be paid to hill, tribal and backward areas. The links between laboratories and universities, on the one hand, and industry and government on the other, must be strengthened. To expedite decision we are reviving the Cabinet committee on Science and Technology and are setting up a Scientific Advisory Committee to the Cabinet.

The task of communicating technology to the people is of gigantic proportions. Science is now accepted as a decisive economic input, but our people as a whole have yet to develop a scientific temper, nor do they yet recognise science as an agent for transforming society or as a new way of looking at problems.

1980 has witnessed notable accomplishments by our scientists. May I pay special tribute to our space scientists, and the engineers and others, without whose dedication they could not have functioned? More achievements await our scientists in space and nuclear physics, in energy and the utilisation of offshore oil resources, in medicine and agriculture. On behalf of the government, I assure you of support in any endeavour you undertake to make our country self-reliant and strong.

My good wishes to you all for this New Year. May I hope, in Einstein's words, that it will be a year of the proper use of Science.

21

'Freedom and Peace'

Inaugural address to Non-Aligned Foreign Ministers' Conference, New Delhi, 9 February 1981

Today we could well echo Mahatma Gandhi's words when he said, 'India wants to be independent of everybody who wants to own this country. We do not want a change of masters. We want to be masters on our own soil.' These words characterise the political basis of non-alignment. We all, coming as we do from different continents, from Asia, Africa, Europe and the Americas, want to be masters of our soil and of our future. It is to this pursuit of freedom, and of peace so essential to freedom, that I welcome you, the delegates, distinguished ministers and representatives of non-aligned countries. Here are assembled nearly a hundred nations. Each has its own distinct personality, its own travails and triumphs. I welcome you to this Conference and to India. Delhi has witnessed history from as far back as the time of our epics. It has been the citadel of empires, and it has seen the fall of empires. To us, it symbolises the will to freedom of resurgent India.

Prescient of our common problems and of the coming need to stand together, my father, Jawaharlal Nehru, convened an Asian Relations Conference in Delhi in March 1947, even before we, and the many others who attended with such enthusiasm, were free.

On the historic and magic day when India's independence was proclaimed, my father declared that India looked at the world with clear and friendly eyes and would co-operate with all nations and peoples of the world in furthering peace, freedom and democracy. Since then we have worked consistently to democratise international relations, we have supported liberation struggles, we have fought against all foreign domination and racism, and have pleaded the cause of co-existence and the peaceful resolution of conflicts. Peace is not that which teeters on the brink. That is the absence of war, but it continues a threat of war. Nor can peace be based on outmoded concepts of imperialism, military alliance, spheres of influence, or balance of power and competition in nuclear and conventional terror.

Mr Chairman, many changes have occurred since the non-aligned Summit was held, in your brave and beautiful country, eighteen months ago. We hear of a crisis of character, a crisis of civilisation. What else can we expect when, having so recently seen the horror and heartbreak of war, countries continue to prepare for a new military confrontation? There is disquiet in Europe, gathering danger in Asia, and new pressures on Latin America and the Caribbean. Non-aligned countries are being asked to stand up and be counted, for or against one side or the other. We see the familiar efforts to turn one non-aligned country against another, to weaken our solidarity and to impair the cohesion of our movement. These efforts are backed by economic threats and blandishments on the one hand, and military might and bases on the other.

The realities of the world situation – the possibility of a nuclear Armageddon caused by a single lapse or rash act – reinforce the relevance of non-alignment and demand a rededication to peace. From this Conference should issue a call to the big powers to tone down belligerent rhetoric, to reduce presences in the Indian Ocean and in various parts of Asia and Africa, and to resume the search for understanding and peace in earnest.

We are all deeply distressed at events in Afghanistan. The unhappy conflict in West Asia between two of our own brothers has had adverse consequences for the peoples of these two countries, as well as other non-aligned nations. These developments have given encouragement to forces which work against our movement and have increased the risk of intervention. Let us hope that big powers will not be tempted to take advantage of local disputes in order to turn them into wider confrontations. In the name of peace, and of the future of mankind, we plead with the combatants, and appeal to those who are waiting in the wings, to call their young men back to their homes.

At this conference we must again raise our voices against the last bastions of colonialism and racism. We salute the victorious people of Zimbabwe and the brave freedom fighters of Namibia, South Africa and Palestine. We deplore the failure of the recent talks in Geneva, and the manner in which the UN Plan, for the independence of Namibia, is being frustrated by South Africa's obstructiveness.

Experience has shown that political subjugation and economic exploitation go hand in hand. We hoped that, through political freedom, we could achieve economic advance. The economic dimension of the policy of non-alignment is no less important than the political. The conferences in Algiers, Colombo and Havana, articulated the economic content of non-alignment. Yet for most of us, economic prospects have been worsening with each passing month. I strongly urge that global negotiations be undertaken without further delay to pave the way for a new international economic order.

At the same time we have our own responsibility, highlighted by the impasse in North-South negotiations, to reduce our vulnerability in the face of action by developed countries. The Havana spirit urged collective self-reliance. The main sanction of developing countries lies in our solidarity. This solidarity must be built by a process of reconciliation and by the harmonisation of our mutual interests.

If protectionism – the classic weapon of the strong against the weak – is used against us, should we not expand trade amongst ourselves? If advanced technology and aid (and even food) are used as instruments of pressure, should we not devise and adopt comprehensive measures for mutually beneficial, financial, technological and agricultural co-operation amongst our countries? Today, our capabilities are diverse enough to permit meaningful transfer of technology, skill and financial resources between ourselves.

Some affluent countries do recognise the inter-dependence of nations and the need for co-operation. Hence our negotiating positions should be formulated in a dynamic context, and our energies concentrated on mapping out our own strategy.

At every meeting of the non-aligned, the big powers seem to redouble their diplomatic and propaganda campaigns to sow suspicion and division between us. As free peoples, we must stand together. Working in unison, on the basis of our original principles and purposes, will fortify us to withstand pressure. Divided, we are vulnerable; united, we can and shall prevail. Let this simple truth guide your deliberations in the next few days. Let us not fall prey to suggestive propaganda. We are here not to juggle with words, but to find a way to reinforce the authority and effectiveness of the non-aligned movement.

Today is regarded as an auspicious day in India. Vasant Panchami is the first day of spring and is dedicated to learning and the arts. It is a good day for a conference devoted to peace and harmony.

On behalf of the government and people of India, I greet you once again. Millions of eyes are focused on this conference and millions of hearts wish you well.

22

'The Future of Non-Alignment'

Keynote address at the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, New Delhi, 11 February 1981

I feel privileged to speak on behalf of the six hundred and sixty million people of India at this meeting to mark the twentieth anniversary of the first Conference of Non-Aligned Nations, held in Belgrade. Even before that Conference, nation after newly-free nation had proclaimed its allegiance to, and adoption of, non-alignment. Close bonds of fellow feeling and common purpose had already been established among them. Belgrade represented a formal demonstration of a community of interest.

Many more nations have joined our family. What is the spirit that moves us? The spirit of national freedom. What is the common objective for which we work? Peace – which can only be achieved and preserved on the basis of political and economic equality among nations, the elimination of military domination and a determination to bring about disarmament.

This ennobling goal was bequeathed to us by the liberators and founding fathers of our various nations. They were indeed emancipators. The list of their names is long, and each is illustrious. But, to me, some stand out as examples worthy of special mention – Jawaharlal Nehru, Ahmed Soekarno, Gamal Abdel Nassar, Kwame Nkrumah and Josip Broz Tito. These are the few whose far-sighted vision nursed the concept, and nurtured the unity, of the non-aligned.

There is an integral, intrinsic and indissoluble link between non-alignment and anti-colonialism. The man who led the very first anti-colonial battle stated in his farewell message: 'It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances in any portion of the foreign world.'

It has also been said: 'He whose freedom is by sufferance, and at the will of a superior, is never free.' Having struggled so hard against domination, could we again accept shelter beneath the umbrellas and shields of others? Could we acquiesce to outside advice as to where our interests lie, and who our friends should be? Was it for this that vast numbers of brave men and women suffered and died?

We want to be friends with all. India's policy is to consolidate friendship where it exists; where there is indifference, to create understanding and interest; and where there is hostility, to make every effort to minimise it. It is also our endeavour to find common areas, however small, between us and other nations, and to enlarge them.

The past few years have seen a welcome trend. Countries bound in military alliances have sought to reach out and build bridges with peoples in other camps. Those who had earlier spared no occasion to declare non-alignment irrelevant, have now changed their stance and announced it to be obsolete. Surely a concept does not become obsolete just when its validity is accepted by its former opponents?

Little did we imagine that the Cold War could so soon reassert itself. The thaw was short-lived. Military alliances are now being refurbished. The danger of armed conflict increases. Clear enough reason for us to remain alert, to speak and work for peace.

Over the centuries, Europe has been the arena of bitter feuds and wars. Even in the eighteenth century, its wars were extended to Asia and America. In the nineteenth century too, European empires fought one another in Asia, Africa and elsewhere. And in our century, Europe and America are conveniently and subtly transferring their problems to Asian soil. The Atlantic has polluted not only itself, but also the Pacific and Indian Oceans.

The present situation is somewhat similar, though far more perilous, to that which faced the 1961 Belgrade Conference. That Summit declared that the consequences of nuclear war would affect the entire world, and all nations and peoples therefore had an abiding concern and interest in the avoidance of this calamity. The Conference then directly appealed to the leaders of the USA and USSR to avert nuclear war.

The non-aligned movement originally developed in the context of a bipolar world. In the course of time other centres of power came up and used their military and economic capacities to bend the policies of newly-free, or small, countries to fit in with their own strategies. Today, even this multi-polarity is less in evidence.

Peace is vital for the evolution of mankind to the fulness of its promise and potential. But the prospects for peace have receded. The nuclear race carries with it the probability of nuclear war, just as rain-clouds bring rain. Saving the world from nuclear war – and other wars – must be one of our foremost concerns.

What was said in Belgrade is still true and bears repetition: 'The non-aligned group of nations do not consider that differences in social systems constitute an insurmountable obstacle to the stabilisation of peace, provided that attempts at domination and interference in the internal affairs of peoples and nations, and the use of ideologies for waging war, exercising pressure or imposing one's will, are ruled out.'

The renewal of assertive animosity between great powers, the competition of military presences in various parts of the globe, particularly in West, South and South East Asia, the vertical increase in the stockpiles of the nuclear powers, the neglect of economic development, and unfair practices in international trade – all these project new problems to challenge and justify our own endeavours. Our obligation is to exercise our independent judgment, individually to build self-reliance, and collectively to resist moves to divide us.

Of great concern to all of us are the wide inequalities and disequilibria in the economic and social structures of the world, and the glaring imbalance between demographic pressures on the one hand, and access to material and technological resources on the other. What should be invested in construction, is being channelled into destruction. There is a global waste of talent and resources.

The solution of today's critical international economic problems needs the total involvement of all nations. Global well-being will be illusory unless the aspirations of developing countries are reflected in the management of the international economy, and in the outcome of international negotiations. No less urgent is the ending of inequalities within our own societies.

At the root of several problems which confront the non-aligned are differences which are imported from outside and which are fostered by external forces. Members of our group have been subjected progressively to a variety of political and economic pressures.

Let us unite to overcome them. Let us reassert the basic proposition of safeguarding freedom and defending justice and peace. For ourselves, also, we must establish guidelines for the promotion of greater cohesion within our movement. Above all, let us resolve to settle disputes among our own member states, reconciling our differences through mutual understanding and restraint, resisting external interference.

Non-alignment is neither neutrality nor indifference. It involves the active and free exercise of judgment on certain principles. Peace is not passive. As a remarkable woman of my country, the poet Sarojini Naidu, said, 'True peace is not the peace of negation, not the peace of surrender, not the peace of the coward, not the peace of the dying, not the peace of the dead, but the peace militant, dynamic, creative, of the human spirit which exalts.' Today let us concern ourselves with the future, mobilising all our resources, material and moral, in our co-operative quest for such a peace.

23

'Public Health and Developing Countries'

Address to the Thirty-Fourth World Health Assembly, Geneva, 6 May 1981

I am delighted to have the opportunity of returning, after many years, to a well-loved city that has played such an important part in history. It is a pleasure to address this august gathering, the World Health Assembly.

Life is not merely for living but for living in health. The health of the individual, as of nations, is of primary concern to us all. Health is not the absence of illness but a glowing vitality, a feeling of wholeness and the capacity for continuous intellectual and spiritual growth. What is our ultimate goal? Is it the mere accretion of medical and other knowledge, the building of better machines and hospitals? Or are all these things meant for a higher purpose, to make man better and more capable of handling the emotional and other stresses posed by material progress, the increasing pace, and the lack of privacy in contemporary living? In India, even in very ancient times, it was believed that physical, mental, and spiritual health were intrinsically interwoven. This is the basis of the science of yoga. The medical system perfected in India, *Ayurveda*, or the Knowledge of the Span of Life, in many ways foreshadowed WHO's own definition of health as 'a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being'.

Dr Mahler and his colleagues deserve congratulations and encouragement on their vision of 'Health for All by the Year 2000'. It envisages strengthening the public health programmes of developing countries, where most diseases are the concomitants of economic backwardness.

Yet it should not be imagined that affluent countries have no health problems. They experience the tensions, mental and physical, to which the dwellers in densely populated cities succumb. So that while the old diseases are being wiped out, new ailments are making themselves felt. New industrial processes are partly to blame for this. But men and women who are willing to risk illness by over-indulgence in eating, smoking or drinking rather than practising the self-restraint so essential to health, are also to blame. In affluent countries, medical treatment has become so exceedingly costly that health insurance has become necessary. Psychiatric treatment is also prohibitively expensive.

It is pertinent to recall that until a century and a half ago, the death rate, and the general prevalence of disease, were roughly the same in all countries. The scientific discoveries of the nineteenth century enabled Europe to reduce its death rate. It was a period that coincided with rapid economic growth. In Africa and Asia, however, the death rate is being brought down by new miracle drugs and campaigns against epidemics. Once it is recognised that better health is not a mere offshoot of overall economic development, and that major improvements in health are possible in the absence of industrialisation, it follows that the patterns of public health and health administration, that are found in the advanced countries, are not necessarily appropriate for the developing ones. The vast increases in population in developing countries are the outcome of successful public health programmes, but they constitute a further challenge to science, to governments and to mankind.

Long before modern communications and economic forces brought about the inter-dependence of the world, epidemics had demonstrated that humanity is one in its vulnerability. Smallpox has been the latest of the epidemics to be eradicated, and an estimated billion dollars have been saved by giving up compulsory vaccination. But is it being used to assist other developmental work on health? In fact the history of international assistance tells us that development does not command the same enthusiasm as defence. In India, ninety-four per cent of resources for development are mobilised internally. Only six per cent comes as aid, but it is important because it provides the catalyst for change.

We are told that we are on the threshold of a new age of biology. Major discoveries are promised in cell biology, genetics and immunology. Developing countries hope that these will enable them to overcome many of the old tropical diseases – particularly those connected with malnutrition, diarrhoeal disorders and communicable diseases. WHO has a commendable programme of tropical medicine. Leaders of medicine all over the world should evolve a special project in this field as part of the 'Health For All' schemes.

May I say a few words about the priorities of medical research? Affluent societies, for understandable reasons, are spending vast sums of money on the search for new products and processes to alleviate suffering and to prolong life. In the process, drug manufacture has become a powerful industry, subject to the same driving considerations as all big business, that is, concentration on profit, fierce competition, and recourse to hard-sell advertising. Medicines which may be of the utmost value to the poorer countries can be bought by us only at exorbitant prices, since our own independent research and production is inadequate. This apart, dangerous new drugs are sometimes tried out on the populations of weaker countries although their use is prohibited within the countries of manufacture. It also happens that through publicity we fall victim to practices which are not only economically wasteful but quite unconducive to good health. You are all familiar with the controversy over the export of baby foods to developing countries.

We do need excellent modern hospitals. But the desire for ever larger hospitals, more often than not oriented towards high-cost modern technological medicine, has to be resisted. Primary health care must be within the reach, in terms of distance as well as money, of all people. The world has found to its dismay that resources are not unlimited. Hence waste of any kind and in any form, particularly in health and hospital care, should be strongly discouraged; and the country's resources must be more equitably distributed. If this is true of the national scene it is even more so internationally.

In India we should like health services to go out to the home, instead of larger numbers of people gravitating towards centralised hospitals. Services must begin where people are, and where problems arise. We have acquired the capability of placing satellites in orbit, but we have not yet been able to reach out to all our rural people. We are, however, engaged in reorganising our medical administration. Our outlook has been admirably expressed in one of the documents prepared by our doctors, which says, 'Health is neither a commodity to be purchased, nor a service to be given; it is a process of knowing, living, participating and being.'

The disparities of levels of medical research and administration also affect us in another way. At great expense and effort we give our brightest young men and women medical education. But a large proportion of them are lured away by the high salaries, and the tempting opportunities for further work, which affluent countries offer.

Thus we lose the skilled manpower so desperately needed to save our own people. The 'brain drain' is the name now given to the technical aid that developing countries give the rich.

My idea of a better ordered world is one in which medical discoveries are free of patents and there is no profiteering from life or death. I also feel that the world community should work out some form of recompense for the loss suffered by developing countries as a result of this migration of trained doctors and nurses.

A country's progress is generally judged in terms of its GNP. But surely the health of the people is also a significant yardstick. That is why we must stress the need for a health revolution in developing countries, not only to wipe out diseases and to make available specialised treatment, but also to provide the equally essential basic health care and preventative measures. Education, from the earliest stages, must include certain elementary information about health, sanitation, cleanliness, the avoidance of contagious diseases, and the preservation of the environment to which all these are linked.

The world, and we in the developing countries, are beset by many health problems. But at this point I should like to take up three specific items. My country has participated successfully in the malaria and smallpox eradication programmes. But the cunning, and instinct for survival, of the ubiquitous mosquito, has outwitted us, and has proved stronger than we had realised; he, or rather she, for I am told that the female is far more deadly, has returned to disturb our sleep. Focusing in this way on special diseases, for the purpose of eradicating them, is a rewarding exercise.

I wish we could do the same for leprosy which is such a dreadful disease, but now well within the powers of contemporary medicine to control. I pay tribute to the dedicated persons who, in my country and elsewhere, have devoted their entire lives to this demanding work. Obviously, such voluntary work can only have limited scope. Leprosy is prevalent in some fifty-three countries. If this problem is not scientifically and vigorously attacked right now, it will spread and be with us for many years. The time has come to utilise better health education, better health technology and advances in immunology to launch a global campaign to eradicate leprosy from the earth within the next twenty years. A major obstacle is the general public's ignorance and superstition regarding leprosy. In its early stages, when a cure could be complete and is easier to achieve, people tend to evade investigation and are reluctant to admit to the disease. This sense of shame is outdated and dangerous.

The second is blindness. It is said that at least fifteen per cent is preventable by the addition of greens to the diet of young children and by simple treatment. WHO could devise a special international programme with emphasis on safeguarding children from blindness, just as this year it has drawn attention to the problems of the disabled.

The third, though no less important, question is that of population control. India is among the very few developing countries, if not the only one, in which the increase in the production of grain is greater than the increase in people. But the cold, hard fact remains that men and women not only need a more varied diet today, they also want much more besides food. At the rate at which we are growing, it will become increasingly difficult to meet the demand for consumer goods, or even living space.

The Government of India was one of the first to take up family planning as a part of its official policy. Our aim is not merely to curb the growth of population but to have happier and healthier families which, in our circumstances, means smaller families. We are disturbed that our recent census shows an alarming increase. It is small satisfaction to know that some of this is due to people living longer lives, and not to a higher birth rate. In fact our family planning programmes are estimated to have prevented twenty-nine million births in the last decade.

Because so much has been misreported, and such an erroneous picture of our policy has been given, I should like to make it clear that we neither believe in, nor have we practised, forcible sterilisation as a matter of policy. We did emphasise what was called 'motivation', that is the persuasion of people to participate in this programme; operations were conducted by competent and authorised medical personnel. In this, due to mistaken over-zealousness or other mischief, there were some unfortunate incidents, but the margin of error was no larger than in other medical situations. What did incalculable harm was the baseless propaganda which some interested parties and individuals unleashed against our family planning schemes, and the political use that was made of it through gross exaggeration and even falsehood.

I shall give two instances to illustrate my point. At that time, there was an insidious and mischievous whispering campaign to the effect that we planned to sterilise the entire population. In the wake of a flash flood in Patna, where the drinking water had become contaminated, people resisted the team of doctors who were sent to inoculate them against cholera. Some months later, our desire to give protection to children at municipal schools against diphtheria, tetanus and whooping cough, was thwarted because the parents were misled into thinking that their young were being sterilised!

By and large, women, even in rural areas, do want family planning. Our peoples are beginning to understand that children have certain needs and are not merely hands to help the family. Controlled families are possible, however, only if parents are reasonably assured of the proper health facilities for the survival of their children. As yet no inexpensive and effective remedy is available. Our scientists are working on this and claim that they are the brink of major discoveries.

I should like to take advantage of my presence at WHO to stress the need for a new dynamic, as well as for a better co-ordinated programme of research, on contraception. Family planning programmes are in need of a big breakthrough. Without a safe, preferably oral, drug which women and men can take, no amount of government commitment and political determination will avail.

Life is, and perhaps always will be, a struggle, although its nature is constantly changing. To meet it we need vision, faith, courage and dogged perseverance. These are the qualities I admire in individuals and in organisations. These are the characteristics of the World Health Organisation. That is why I have come all this way to express our appreciation of its work, and to assure it of my government's support. I give it my good wishes.

24

'Nature and Energy'

Address to the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, at Nairobi, 10 August, 1981

It is a privilege to address this assembly of statesmen and scientists. India has always applauded the United Nations' endeavour to bring the world together for peace and prosperity. We affirm our appreciation of its efforts and commend its accomplishments. The pleasure is enhanced by this significant event taking place in Nairobi, on the soil of resurgent Africa, whose dreams and aspirations are similar to our own. We are especially glad that the President of Kenya, H. E. Dr Moi, and other Heads of Governments are taking such a keen interest. As Chairman of the Organisation of African Unity, and as an outstanding leader of Africa, President Moi has guided and participated in many important decisions. I think, I am voicing the sentiments of all those present here, in expressing my deep appreciation of the inaugural address and of the insight which it showed into the problem which we are going to discuss here.

We humans have regarded Earth not just as a playground but as a place to use, despoil, and to destroy. We are too engrossed with the immediate, too absorbed with petty individual problems, to look at basic issues. Today's problem has taken centuries to grow into its present threatening proportions. We are searching for new and renewable resources because the fossil fuels on which we had grown dependent are, fast and recklessly, being depleted, in the hands of the few who control them. What we have to understand is that nothing will work in the long term unless there is a change in our thinking, unless we see ourselves not as masters of the universe but as tiny components of an exceedingly complex system in which the smallest part has a specific role. In the law of the cosmos, the microcosm is no less important than the macrocosm. I have never ceased to be awe-struck by the wonder of the balance in nature, where waste itself has its uses in the renewal of life. Man, in his greed and belief in his own power, has ignored natural laws. We have disturbed, and continue to disturb, this marvellous equilibrium, yet we are astonished at the dangers that confront us, which we ourselves have created. We must view energy in its entirety, for problems of survival and progress are not pieces to be put together, but are inseparable parts of an integrated whole.

The reality of the energy crisis hangs perilously over not only Asia, Africa and Latin America, but also the developed regions of Europe and America. We have an awesome task. The mutual interest of diverse groups and nations lies in more than merely preventing a military holocaust, which by its very nature is unlikely to leave any victors. Enlightened statesmen and leading thinkers now forcefully argue that there is a serious menace to human existence from the unintentional, albeit inevitable, consequences of the short-sighted and self-centred economic policies of individual nations.

The present pattern of exploitation of the world's resources and the resultant search for, and attempt to dominate, world energy resources, can only create friction. Monopoly of the energy potential by the affluent is not only depriving the poor, and arresting their growth, but also leading to instability and insecurity. Similarly, within nations this serious imbalance in energy supply aggravates social ills, especially those associated with unplanned urbanisation.

In contemporary India, as in some other parts of the world, energy resources range from such primary and uncomplicated forms as manual labour and animal power to the most advanced use of nuclear and solar-energy technology. Impressive quantities of commercial energy are regularly produced from coal, lignite, oil and the hydro-electric potential of waterways. At the same time there is also extensive use of familiar non-commercial sources such as firewood, agricultural waste and animal dung. Our planning is enriched, but also complicated, by the contrast between urban India with its organised activity, and the decentralised rural sector. These parallel streams are sources of strength, although rising expectations have led to some social strains, aggravated by the ever-increasing cost of energy.

A realistic understanding of our complex social and economic conditions, and our broader vision of the world community, have enabled us to shield our development from the consequences of rapid and unidimensional industrialisation. We emphasise our commitment modestly, though firmly, to the rational use of energy and natural resources, with the ultimate objective of preserving our environment.

There is little possibility of any fundamental change in the existing structure of the energy programme. We are, instead, aiming at a two-tier re-organisation. Many of the renewable sources of energy, that have fallen into disuse in the developed world, continue to provide a substantial share of our energy needs, particularly in the domestic sector. Firewood is an obvious example, though it is inefficiently used. Such loss of potential energy is not restricted to unsophisticated enterprises. The steam engine is still indispensable but it remains relatively primitive. Similarly there has been very little innovation in agricultural implements. We have initiated research and development in the field of energy-producing and -conserving tools. In this jet age, people refer to the bullock cart as a symbol of the past. In India, however, animals provide more power than all our power stations put together, with their installed capacity of twenty-nine thousand megawatts. Replacing them would entail a further investment of twenty-five to forty billion dollars in electricity, over and above the loss to the farm economy of manure and cheap fuel. The fitting of tyres on traditional bullock carts has made them faster and reduced, by more than half, the wear and tear on the animal, the cart and the road. Ball bearings on hand-driven grinding stones have mitigated the drudgery of village women. Modifying designs of household implements like stoves, and improving the architecture of homes and public buildings, can also make an enormous difference.

Another experiment, inexpensive and of almost immediate utility, is the generation of bio-gas from city and town sewage. The extra amount of power required is small, but it increases the output of power by seventy per cent. Its financial returns are encouraging, apart from its great advantage of preventing river pollution.

The early stages of development, the improvement in health, the increase in the life span and diminution of infant mortality, lead to an expanding population. Industrial development tends to concentrate people in an unwholesome way. But if energy is available everywhere locally, decentralised development becomes more viable. It injects greater confidence into each locality and decreases disparities that cause regional discontent.

If the laws of nature are thwarted, renewable sources will also be exhausted. The indiscriminate felling of trees had denuded our forests, creating disastrous ecological imbalances that affect the very quality of life. In its sternest form, nature exacts retribution for the treeless scars on its mountain sides; landslides, devastating floods and the silting up of reservoirs and rivers are the result. Rainfall begins to dwindle and the desert resumes its deadly march.

We are endeavouring to harness the vast potential of sun, wind and water. Solar energy is already being used for cooking, for heating water, and for pumping it for irrigation, for crop drying and so on. Another promising item in the new energy programme is bio-gas which is produced mainly from agricultural waste, but also from the ubiquitous water hyacinth, that has for years been blocking waterways and clogging fields.

The national paper we have presented at this conference gives details of our developmental programmes. We have offered suggestions for action at national, regional and international levels. In November we are organsing a seminar on 'Energy Options for Developing Countries'. India is ready to help, and share her experience with her partners in the world energy programme. The history of developed industrial countries has been different. The industrial revolution succeeded because of the availability of an abundant supply of cheap fossil fuels. But when the oil producers asserted their control over prices, these countries were startled to discover that their assumed right to unlimited quantities of fuel was an illusion. The adjustment process has been relatively easy for the industrialised countries however; minor economies in consumption enable them to control the growth in demand, and their losses can be made up by revising the price of their exports. Thus, developing countries are hit from two sides – the high cost of oil, and the higher costs of imports of manufactured goods and industrial raw materials. We have neither the margin of waste, nor the wherewithal, to meet the increasing expense.

It must not be forgotten that developing countries use a mere fraction of the total energy consumed by industrialised countries. As their standards of living rise, they will demand much more conventional energy, contributing to the already serious depletion. And more energy will be required, not just for industrialisation and urbanisation, but also for agriculture. A large part of India's petroleum imports are converted into fertilisers, and a quarter of all our electricity goes into agricultural operations. If developing nations do not get the energy they need and deserve, how can they fight poverty? At the same time their financial constraints deny them the investment necessary to harness energy through known technologies. Hence the search for new technologies that require less capital. The concept of substituting labour for capital is a familiar one. We now look to technological innovation as a substitute for capital. Should not efficiency be measured in terms not only of the labour and capital saved, but of the energy conserved?

One of the main reasons for the present disturbed and insecure state of the world is the scramble for the pre-emption of the world's fossil fuel deposits and the accumulation of increasingly sophisticated and energy-intensive weapon systems to which the arms race and the policies of confrontation have led. If the status of the affluent and powerful is to be maintained, existing infrastructures and disparities must be kept in being. Hence the urgent need for an energy revolution. We must move from the present international economy, primarily dependent on hydrocarbons, to one increasingly based on new and renewable sources of energy. Such a transition is likely to change international relationships profoundly. Instead of the physical transfer of resources, there could be co-operation in harnessing widely dispersed resources with the appropriate technology. With a proper sharing of knowledge, developing countries would not need to invest in rapidly obsolescent technologies, and the process of transition would itself be more prolonged. Such a global outlook does not impair the sovereignty of individual nations and is compatible with national policies.

Developed economies should be prepared to accept some of the responsibility for redefining their relationship with the developing world. The new international economic order and recognition of the common heritage of mankind, need to be endorsed in theory and in practice. Every international forum should aim at changing attitudes so that we move from exploitation and bargaining to co-operation and accommodation. Costs are high at the experimental stage and come down only as production goes up. It makes more sense for those who can afford them to go in for substitutes rather than those who don't have the means.

Emphasis on the need for new sources of energy, however, is not an excuse for diverting attention from the immediate problem of the equitable sharing of conventional energy. New sources are crucial for all those that have an abundance of presently available fuels, as well as for those not so favourable endowed. A more equal distribution of conventional fuels would be a significant step towards developing renewable sources.

No single programme will suit all countries. Each must draw up its own energy programme and build the necessary infrastructure. Throughout the world, measures must be taken to apply sophisticated technology to renewable energy resources: the fuller harnessing of hydro-power, large-scale programmes of reforestation, bio-gas production, the use of solar energy for low and medium temperature requirements like water heating, and of wind and solar energy for pumping. International effort is essential but it cannot replace endogenous development. Past mistakes can be avoided and research need not be duplicated. Technology will continuously unfold new possibilities. Let us take nothing for granted, least of all, nature.

We expect the international community to support and reinforce this effort, especially in the developing countries. But developing countries must strengthen their collective self-reliance. Technical co-operation, the sharing of training facilities, the exchange of experts and information, joint R & D programmes, including the testing of equipment, mutually beneficial consultancy, and related measures, are ways to make self-reliance a reality. A freer flow of technical information and a more liberal transfer of technology, from high pressure areas to the depressed regions of the economic atlas, should become a tenet of the new world order.

In their pursuit of technological advance, industrialised countries have exploited conventional energy so recklessly that they cannot now evade the responsibility of helping the developing world in its confrontation with this crippling crisis. But it is noticeable that companies with large oil interests have acquired a powerful hold over research and development in the new energy technology. For developing countries, funds are scarce. The mobilisation of aid by international institutions, and bilateral credit for this worthwhile investment, are crucial. I should like to express my gratitude to those countries with investible surpluses who have already made appreciable gestures.

Mutual recrimination and confrontation do not help. We are all, the developed, the developing and the underdeveloped, in the same predicament. The United Nations has brought us here in the hope of enlarging the awareness of humanity and arousing the conscience of governments. This conference, must not only draw attention to our global obligations, it must outline a world policy on energy, it must generate momentum and indicate a course of action. An international consortium dedicated to mobilising bilateral credit and aid from institutions, and which would allow for compact planning and monitoring of the world energy programme, would be most useful. We should initiate and expand programmes for technical assistance in energy planning and manpower training, and we should provide support for research and development and pre-investment studies.

The energy problem is only a part of a wider concern for the environment, one that encompasses planning for the prevention of social tensions and of the kind of economic conditions that compel vast numbers to migrate. Research and experience indicate that new sources of energy create less environmental pollution than conventional ones. The question now posed is whether unscientific large-scale utilisation, even of such new resources as solar energy, will invite adverse ecological consequences. We must remain on guard. Everything that is born has within it the seeds of its own destruction. I am told that physicists are talking of anti-entropic energy. Not being an expert, I cannot know how it will work or what will be its repercussions, or those of the new experiments in bio-engineering.

May I go back to the point I made at the beginning. However great the rush of activity, or the pressure of events, can we not take time to think more deeply and in terms of a wider perspective? The problems are too vast to be handled by a small group of people. We, who are in public life, must involve the scientists, the seers of our age, the truly religious. We need their vision to probe and find paths which will determine the future of mankind and of life on earth. No matter how remarkable the new discoveries, the ultimate response lies in the minds of people and the wisdom with which they will act. Will they view the world as one, or will they fragment it? Will they put time into the compartments of past, present and future, or will they see it as a continuous flow of cause and effect?

We speak of renewable resources. Isn't the human spirit the most potent of them all? Let us join in invoking the human spirit, in rescuing it from apathy and resignation, and making it buoyant and spontaneous once again. We are at the threshold of a new age. St John Perse, the poet, said, 'We had a rendezvous with the end of an age.'

Let us join him in asking: 'Do we find ourselves with men of another age?'

Let a powerful call go out from this conference to make energy a focal point of contemporary international co-operation and collaboration. Let equitable distribution of our conventional stocks, and joint development of new and renewable sources, become the test for the enlightened will of nations to survive in comfort, in harmony, and with dignity.

25

'The Role of the Scientist'

Inaugural address to the Sixth International Conference of Women Engineers and Scientists, Bombay, 8 September 1981

Women scientists have their own problems. They are doing excellent work in laboratories and on scientific and engineering projects. A few have reached the highest echelons of science, as indeed of all spheres of activity. So they must rid themselves of any feeling of inferiority. Determination and constant effort are the keys to success. This is as true of women as of men.

In India, we have another problem. We spend enormous amounts on training young scientists. Much work awaits them. Yet the opportunities of professional advancement and material improvement offered by affluent countries tempt them to migrate. We lose people whom we have educated at high cost. They, the advanced countries, get well-trained people at little expense. A United Nations survey has computed the cost of this brain drain, designating it as a form of technological assistance given by the poor to the rich – the sum is considerable.

Your agenda deals with problems which are of importance to our plan for development, in India, as well as to a large part of the globe, problems that are often of vital concern to women. These you will discuss. I should like to draw your attention to the wider perspective in which these questions should be viewed. Since we are all parts of the whole, general problems are of concern to us. Science is in a peculiar predicament today. It enjoys a tremendous prestige yet evokes unprecedented disquiet. There is a galloping growth in science and in scientists – each pursuing her or his special line of investigation or activity. Every now and then we hear of some spectacular discovery.

Personally, I never cease to marvel and to feel elated and proud at each new scientific development wherever it takes place. I am equally astonished that so many, even of the younger generation, take these wonders for granted and are bored by them; in some regions of the world, people are too engrossed with the struggle for survival and in others over-abundance, over-indulgence, have eroded their spiritual, moral and aesthetic main-springs. It led Martin Luther King to say:

> 'Our scientific power has outrun our spiritual powers. We have guided missiles and misguided men.'

It is the search for truth, and the desire to apply knowledge for the benefit of the society in which they live that drives scientists on. Science and technology have given us a level of comfort and prosperity undreamt of in earlier years even by the most affluent. We, in the developing countries, look to science, not for luxuries it affords but to solve such age-old problems as privation, and to bring about both greater social and economic justice and equality of opportunity.

We need science for our immediate imperative of development – to improve efficiency, to produce more, to save time and labour, to reduce drudgery and wear at all levels. And it is not just the big spectacular advances for which science is important, but the small improvements and adaptations, visible, and of immense immediate help, in every-day life, especially to the weaker sections of society. We want science in the humblest tribal hut; in our fields as well as in sophisticated industries and nuclear power plants. We need it in order to become self-reliant individuals, living in self-reliant nations.

Science has not let us down. But sometimes fills us with dismay to see how often science and technology have been used, unscientifically, for profit, or for some real or imagined success, that ignores the long-term chain reaction.

There was a time when scientists themselves were so confident, even ecstatic, about their discoveries, and the vast potential of knowledge and achievement which they had opened up, that they gave no thought to the likely outcome. Perhaps they never imagined that authorities could be so short-sighted, or it may be that they were too absorbed in the excitement of possible discoveries, to look beyond them. Scientists believed that they had, or would soon have, all the answers. Our own faith in their ability to solve all our problems was boundless.

In fact, science has raised as many new problems as it has solved. Much of the early mining, irrigation and industrialisation had a certain quality of reckless adventurism. It has led to exhaustion, pollution and deforestation; problems that differ little from those of poverty itself. The world is gradually becoming aware of them; and of how terribly difficult, costly and time consuming they are to rectify. The affluent countries are in a better position to deal with them. As Thomas Hobbes pointed out a long time ago, science is indeed the knowledge of consequences. If science has conferred unprecedented levels of prosperity on some nations, has it not also led mankind, as a whole, nearer to total annihilation?

The present task of Indian scientists is to relate new knowledge to old experience. In the initial enthusiasm for modernity there was a tendency to reject all that was old as irrelevant or superstitious. Time has revealed that there are grains of sense even in what are regarded as old wives' tales. Plants and herbs are our friends once more. We find that there is commonsense in traditional building materials and time-worn methods of farming. Until recently our farmers were ridiculed for scratching the earth. Today we are told that deep ploughing tractors can harm the soil. I am glad that your own programme of discussion touches on some of these points.

Even the advanced nations recognise the miracle of photosynthesis and other natural processes. Fortunes have to be spent in laboratories to synthesise, even in minute quantities, the rare enzymes and chemicals that living bodies produce with such natural ease. Our deep interest in appropriate technology, however, does not mean that we will give up the basic science, so fundamental to our goal of self-reliance. The two streams must flow together, interacting and perhaps influencing each other.

In the last three or four centuries, scientific discoveries have had an impact on political ideas and social organisations. The great debate over the use of nuclear energy, and the current heart-searching caused by the dilemmas of genetic engineering, show that scientists have moral concerns.

Along with other citizens, scientists are becoming more aware of the major problems that science poses for the human race. No longer is it claimed that science is value-neutral. The blame for its misuse lies on all of us. We should accept it and try to do something about it. Ultimately the human mind is the master and it must decide how to use the tools at its disposal.

We are faced with choosing between two conflicting goals. Either the present situation continues in which eighty per cent of the earth's scarce resources are exploited by a mere twenty per cent of its population, creating tensions leading to war and destruction which might envelop all, or science is used to provide the means of creating conditions for the eradication of poverty and disease, and bringing harmony amongst different peoples. Obviously we must make every effort to adopt the second choice.

National loyalties do not clash with international priorities. To a lesser or greater extent, every country and every individual is dependent on others. The fact of this inter-dependence, founded on independence, is being increasingly accepted.

Let us hope that the common danger which confronts the human species will compel all women and men, and especially young people and scientists of all ages, those working in billion-dollar laboratories or in shoe-string outfits, to raise their voices in defence of sanity. Science should stand for the truth that serves goodness and beauty, it should be regarded as a continuous journey into the past, present and future, neglecting no aspect of previous or prevalent thought on what the future might bring.

As Maurice Maeterlinck said: 'It is not enough to possess a truth; it is essential that the truth should possess us.'

I entirely agree with the previous speakers who urged rational and scientific thinking, and the promotion of what we call the scientific temperament. But keep in the mind that new superstitions are constantly arising. Let us revive the spirit of wonder and hope that urges ordinary people to feel involved enough to do ordinary things extraordinarily well, or to do extraordinary things. Let science be used to discover, not only the world and outer space, but also ourselves, to bring to all sections of the people a finer quality of life, that is, a higher level of development and evolution, not merely material but intellectual and spiritual as well.

26

'The Search for a Global Compact'

At the First Session of the Cancun Summit, Mexico, 23 October 1981

It is indeed a privilege to form part of this distinguished group. Mexican hospitality is proverbial. The beauty and harmony of the surroundings are an added bonus, helping to create the proper atmosphere. I thank you sincerely, Mr President, for your warm reception and the personal consideration given to our well-being. But, above all, I thank you for the initiative which you and Chancellor Kreisky have taken in bringing us all together.

We greatly miss our absent friend, Chancellor Kreisky, who persevered for so long to bring this meeting about, as well as Chancellor Schmidt and the Presidents of Brazil and the Ivory Coast. I am sure I echo your sentiments in wishing them speedy and complete recovery.

I welcome Mr Trudeau as co-chairman, not only because of his known competence in such a role, but because of the special concern he has shown in the matters under discussion.

Around the table here, coming as we do from various parts of the globe and from entirely disparate circumstances, we have differing points of view. Some of us are old friends. We now have the opportunity of getting acquainted with others. All, I believe, are committed to a better future. We represent our own nations and peoples. I do not claim to speak for others. I speak for the ideals for which India has struggled, for the cause of peace, the cause of a more egalitarian society, for the easing of the burdens of the underprivileged, and underdeveloped countries.

Here, in Cancun, we have come to achieve understanding and, if possible, to devote our attention to finding ways of co-operation between developed and developing countries.

Thoughtful contributions have been made to the problems which we all face. Obviously there are differences of approach and of emphasis. I hope that in such a gathering the spirit of conciliation will prevail and that it will enable us to reach a mutually satisfactory consensus.

Way back in 1955, my father spoke of the inter-dependence of continents and of our desire to be friends with, and to co-operate with, Europe and America, along with others. Friendship cannot be meaningful without equality. I believe this is the mood today all over the world, in Africa, in Asia and in Latin America. There has always been inter-dependence of some kind but today it is between nations who are politically independent, conscious of their rights and of their legitimate place in the international community. The advances in technology, transport and communications have made such inter-dependence more relevant, indeed inescapable.

Development cannot be imported. Nor can it conform to a given pattern. It has to come through our own determined efforts, tailored to our peculiar conditions and others. We, the developing countries, are working for economic co-operation amongst ourselves and for collective self-reliance. But we cannot avoid being affected adversely by outside events. This calls for international understanding and structural adjustments in the world economy itself. That is why we are meeting here for a dialogue on major issues of international co-operation for development.

Some of the issues before us are highly technical, and we are not a body of experts. In many areas there are differences of perception, as well as of interest, which will need negotiation and we are not a negotiating forum. Perhaps all we can do is to agree to discuss them and to assure those who are not present, but are equally concerned, that there will emerge from this meeting political support for early resumption of negotiations on a global basis after due preparation.

In other forums we have discussed how vital it is to increase levels of production in poorer countries, and to accelerate their rates of growth. Trade and financial flows are the only means of rectifying existing imbalances in the global economy. It is tragic that in an age of growing knowledge and capacity, income disparities between developed and developing countries are widening, and that vast numbers in some countries are denied even their basic needs.

We are told that the world economy is in a bad shape, that even the most prosperous of nations have inflation and unemployment, and suffer from a recessionary condition and a slowing down of growth. Half a century ago, industrialised nations found themselves in a somewhat similar predicament. Their attempt to solve these problems by inward-looking policies and protectionism, preferential blocs, currency depreciation and similar devices, plunged the world into its worst ever depression, culminating in World War II.

Productive capacity has grown tremendously, so have human problems. It is just not possible for the international community to contain the prevailing levels of inequality and poverty that pose such a threat to the peace and stability in which we all have a stake.

I think you will agree that the contribution of science and technology to human welfare would be more significant if scientific research were not misdirected, and scarce raw materials were not diverted to military purposes.

The complex problems of the developed, as well as of the developing, countries can be solved better by co-operation than confrontation. We all stand to benefit from the prosperity of our trading partners; stagnation in industrialised economies lowers the export earnings of developing countries. A rise in the income levels of developing countries generates growth in undeveloped countries, increasing their exports and creating employment.

Global negotiations do have urgency. We are not wedded to catch-phrases. We are more interested in results and substance. While preparing for them, other pressing problems brook no delay. Problems have been identified and solutions suggested. In its proposals for a summit, the Brandt Commission urged world leaders to address themselves to an emergency programme dealing with food, energy and financial flows.

Freedom from hunger must be at the top of our priorities. Millions of people remain under-nourished and cannot afford the food they need. Without purchasing power, they are ignored by the market forces which are supposed to balance demand and supply. Outlines of a food security programme have been drawn up. The storing of emergency reserves is an essential measure.

In the long run, world food production must be augmented. The developing countries have the potential for doing this, but productivity is low and irrigation is woefully inadequate. The improved supply of fertilisers, better techniques and improved seeds can lead to what, in India, has become known as the green revolution. But efforts to raise output must have support of an inflow of resources from those countries which can provide the finance, the technical know-how and the other inputs.

Successive adjustments in oil prices, which have their historical rationale, have nevertheless seriously worsened the balance-of-payments positions of the oil-importing, developing countries. But cutting back on imports, they will fall short of their growth targets, and this will cause an overall decline in world trade. Should there not be a determined effort to help them tide over the crisis? Developing countries do have the potential of new energy resources. There is increasing consensus for an energy affiliate. Call it what you will, additional resources have to be found for this purpose.

Whether we focus on food, or on energy, or survey the problems of development as a whole, it is crucial for developing countries to have increased financial flows. Their balance-of-payments deficits, and their need for the resources of development, are enormous. There are warnings of disaster if these resources are denied. Bilaterally, and through international financial institutions, official development assistance has been extended to developing countries. But there is a need for increased assistance that has been acknowledged in various forums at different times. We hope that the expectations aroused will not be belied.

India is no longer among the weakest or poorest nations. It has been able to move out of that situation only through the most strenuous attempt to develop; we have increased agricultural production to the point where not only are we self-sufficient in food-grains, but we have been able to help our neighbours and others. We have also greatly augmented and diversified our industry. We can justly claim that we have made good and full use of the aid and credit received from outside, and that we have repaid our debts in full and on time. Today, foreign credit represents only nine per cent of the total resources needed for our Sixth Plan for development. And this we have done in conditions of democracy, of full freedom of the individual and of the press. We have reached the level at which outside help makes all the difference, where attaining the take-off stage in development is concerned. Far from being a burden, we can be a source of strength to others.

With the practical experience gained over the years, existing multilateral financial institutions can swing into action and produce more effective results at lower costs. We are, however, perturbed at what appear to be pressures that could limit their efficacy. We should like to see acceptance of the Melbourne declaration that international institutions should rise above particular ideologies.

Apparently there is a belief that private capital can channel resources to developing countries more effectively than multilateral public finance. Private investment can be quite useful in certain areas. It is hardly likely, however, to provide resources for the long term developments that have large social benefits but low market profits. Nor can it help in alleviating the balance-of-payments problems of most developing countries. Each country's policy towards private foreign investment is entitled to respect. In India we have what is called a 'mixed' economy. There is considerable scope for the private sector. There is also an important role for the public or state sector. There is no conflict between the two.

We, in the developing world, have a long, hard path to climb. We shall persevere in our struggle to build modern economies, and to ensure higher standards of living, for our peoples.

International co-operation and the assistance of developed countries are pivotal in quickening this process. We are not supplicants, nor are we confrontationists. It is our experience that the interests of the developed and developing countries are so intertwined that we can all survive in harmony only in conditions of true inter-dependence. The mutuality of interest between different nations and peoples can only be served by the establishment of a new international economic order, based on justice and equality. We earnestly seek a global compact which will ensure the development of the poorer countries along with the prosperity of the developed nations, in circumstances of international peace and security.

Seldom has a gathering attracted such attention or raised such hopes. Yet we have come with some apprehension regarding the outcome of our meeting. We cannot afford to be defeatist. The goodwill we witnessed yesterday in various informal gatherings and in the speech made this morning, is a hopeful sign. The mind has to put aside the fragmentary utilitarian approach and to look anew at the earth, the matrix of human heritage. Its problems are global and have to be viewed as such. That will be possible only when man symbolically opens his hands in a gesture of fearlessness and sharing. The sprouting shoot that cleaves the earth is tender. There is fragility in all beginnings! Yet a beginning has to be made. Let us at least initiate a process of action.

27

'The Development of Foreign Policy'

Address to celebrate the Silver Jubilee of the School of International Studies of Jawaharlal Nehru University, 30 October 1981

It is a pleasure to participate in the Silver Jubilee Celebrations of the School of International Studies, especially because of its association with my father, and with Pandit Kunzru. Both believed that public life should be permeated by the spirit of service, and by knowledge and continuous study. I am glad that Dr Appadorai's services are being recognised. He is a pioneer of international studies and a scholar reputed for his integrity. This is a tribute he richly deserves.

Diplomacy and the conduct of foreign affairs are generally thought to require a certain shrewdness. Perhaps this is important; Machiavelli and Chanakya certainly thought so. But more important are a larger perspective and a far-sighted vision. The object of establishing this School was to enhance the intellectual input in the making of our foreign policy.

A country's foreign policy is shaped by many forces. Not only do its position on the map, its neighbouring countries, the policies they adopt and the action they take have a great influence, but its historical experiences in the aggregate, its past successes and difficulties, must also be taken into account. For instance, a nation which has suffered colonialism cannot but adopt a particular stance on questions affecting national independence. A nation which had to struggle and sacrifice to gain its freedom, has a different attitude to hegemony from those which achieved sovereignty the easy way. A nation which has been frequently subjected to invasions, has to be specially careful about its security. Other determining factors are the country's size and the kind of society it has, the pattern of its natural resources, the level of its own technological development, and the nature of its economic needs.

Foreign policy cannot be very different from domestic aspirations and policies. The very concept of nationhood is of fairly recent origin. Modern nationalism arose in Europe and America a few centuries ago. Elsewhere it has developed in the present century. Many nations are breakaway parts of old empires. Some have grown from the coming together of tribes and regions. A common religion or a common language are often regarded as the prerequisites of nationhood. Yet we know that religious or linguistic uniformity is no more essential for national cohesion than ethnic homogeneity. We see that nations with great diversity can be as strong, and can be imbued with as keen a sense of national purpose, as those with one religion, one language, or one race.

One of the most fascinating riddles of history is the question of what makes a group of people share a sense of common destiny. Almost always it is the result of a commonly endured hardship and humiliation, often it comes from being summoned to a heroic effort by a great figure, or group of people, who inspire them with a vision of truth or glory. Such men are acclaimed as founding fathers.

It was our struggle for freedom which built our nation. It was long drawn out and exceptionally harrowing, though often exhilarating. How well do I remember the moments of uplift when hardship seemed so small a price for such a glorious cause. The thought of freedom lured us on, as does a bright light at the end of a dark tunnel. So long as I knew I was a participant in the great endeavour, it did not matter that I might not live to see freedom. But many were the moments of gloom when it seemed that the movement was flagging. In retrospect, perhaps, it was a blessing that our struggle was long drawn out, for this gave our leaders time to deliberate and plan. It gave our freedom movement a mass base such as no other movement has had. During his exacting apprenticeship to Mahatma Gandhi, who had his finger on the pulse of the people, Jawaharlal Nehru evolved our national philosophy of democracy; non-sectarian tolerance in religion, social and economic justice, and a spirit of independence in foreign relations.

Seldom was a movement so conscious of its international context and significance. In the early 'thirties, Harindranath Chattopadhyaya expressed the national sentiment in these words:

> 'Let us shout from tower and steeple,
> now our banner is unfurled.
> That by fighting for our people,
> we are fighting for the world.'

We kept in close touch with others with similar aims, and with elements in Europe and America who championed human dignity. We saw, with clarity, the divergence between what most governments of the dominant powers of the day professed, and what they practised. Some of you may remember how curtly we were informed that the freedoms, promised under the Atlantic Charter, did not apply to the people of India and others in Asia and Africa. From such experience was born the concept of non-alignment, the logical continuation of the spirit of non-co-operation with colonialism.

The main critics of Jawaharlal Nehru's foreign policy were those who did not understand the indivisibility of freedom, or the urgency of economic and social reform; and, of course, some who had remained aloof from the mainstream of national thinking. There were also those who were more preoccupied with the ideological struggle between world capitalism and world communism, than with our own nation-building. The forthrightness, with which we spoke out on world affairs, consolidated our own feeling of national identity. Alignment might bring more aid but it does not strengthen the self-reliant foundations of freedom. It also inhibits people from making their own economic decisions. Hence non-alignment helped us to become more technologically self-reliant.

Non-alignment is a policy, but not an objective by itself. The objective is freedom of judgment, and of action, so as to safeguard the nation's true strength and basic interests. Temporary additions to strength can sometimes compromise long-term security. Had we built our defence forces at the behest of others, or through gifts of armaments, the centre of decision and policy making would have moved out of our hands. There are instances when recipients of armaments do not confine themselves to serving the interests of the donors, but use them for their own purposes. We ourselves have been the victims of such diversion.

Military alliances entail obligations that may not be entirely consistent with a nation's interests. Hence many countries, even within such alliances, are somewhat restive and apprehensive about bases and missiles located in their territory. Within the two opposing blocs, the independence of mind and action implied by non-alignment has begun to gain a toe-hold. Nations cannot be classified as permanent enemies or permanent allies. So while we deplore the return to the postures of the Cold War, we also note that the allies of the big powers are beginning to have reservations about being pulled into crusades and grand designs.

In the early years, we had neither the resources nor the desire to become entangled in the rivalries, conflicts and preparations for war of the big power blocs. Our problems were so big as to require our total attention. Only in conditions of peace could we concentrate on development. This consideration remains valid today. Whatever the difficulties of self-reliance, and we should not under-estimate them, we cannot afford dependence on others, either for development or defence. A small country could, and some have, achieved growth through large scale aid. India is far too vast, and its problem too massive, to be bailed out by any other country. For us, self-reliant development is not merely desirable, it is the only possible way.

Self-reliance does not mean isolation or repudiation of co-operation in technological, economic, cultural and political matters. As I pointed out at the Cancun Conference, some kind of inter-dependence has always been there. Today it must exist in conditions of equality and self-respect, and on the secure foundation of the independence of nations.

I spoke earlier of the national climate that Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru developed in favour of democracy, secularism, socialism and non-alignment. There was opposition, and it was constant and considerable. They had to fight every inch of the way. Gandhiji faced hostility from Sanatanists, from latter-day loyalists, and from political radicals who regarded him as an apologist for the old order. In addition, some of his own close associates had reservations about his faith in our rural people. My father’s economic and foreign policies were attacked by rightists and leftists alike. He was accused simultaneously of being a communist and an agent of international capitalism! Many newspapers were active adversaries. It is a measure of the historical correctness of Gandhiji and Nehru, that those who criticised them in their life-time, now praise them!

I am recounting all this to emphasise that even when a policy is the right one, and reflects both the desires and the interests of the people, it may not be acceptable to those political parties whose attitudes flow from their own ideological preoccupations. Policy-makers should not be concerned with gaining the consensus of the parties but with relevance and correctness and acceptance by the people at large. A policy should be designed to safeguard and promote the national interest and still be in consonance with the larger principles of peace and justice. If strength can be reconciled with humanity, that is the true test of any government’s policies.

Even when the direction is clear, foreign policy needs careful steering, because it is buffeted by waves and winds from within and without. The framers of policy and their executors and interpreters – the country's diplomatic service – need the benefit of continuous public debate. Parliament is important and the press too has a special role. No less is the contribution of universities and the academic community. We require more specialisation, and more thorough-going multi-disciplinary area studies, as well as specialised assessments of individual problems in foreign policy and national security. In the absence of these, we are too readily influenced by what foreigners think and feel. Did not many people fall into the trap of projecting us, in the early 'fifties, as an alternative to China or, later, into describing India as a major regional power? Since advocates of special courses of action write with evangelical fervour, we are sometimes carried away be ideological rhetoric rather than by hard argument. The purpose of our centres of higher learning should be to strengthen our intellectual self-reliance. From the School of International Studies we expect books, and studies, which analyse world issues from the Indian point of view; and we expect to produce specialists who will win recognition and respect within this country and abroad.

I have touched on the broad and more obvious aspects of foreign policy. But in today's world, the advance of science and technology plays a crucial role. I have recently read these words spoken by a foreign TV commentator: 'One of the most amazing facts, when you look back at the history of technology, is that the public, in the late twentieth century, had not a glimmering of what was really happening to them. The interesting question is whether the course of history would have been different if the public had been able to comprehend the journey on which they had embarked.'

My good wishes to your School on its completing twenty-five years. I have pleasure in inaugurating its Silver Jubilee celebrations.

28

'Agriculture: Self-Reliance and Inter-Dependence'

McDougall Lecture, Twenty-First Session of FAO, 9 November 1981

The hungry of the world owe much to Frank McDougall, who was one of those responsible for setting up this great organisation. It is a privilege to deliver this lecture in his honour, especially in the presence of so many distinguished persons directly concerned with the planning and execution of agricultural programmes in various parts of the world. Frank McDougall was deeply conscious of global inter-dependence in agriculture. He lit the lamp and we have to guard the flame. I should also like to congratulate the Director-General, Dr Edouard Sauoma, on his re-election. We wish him success in his efforts for world food security.

Life and food are inseparable. As a hymn from India's ancient books of wisdom, the Upanishads, puts it:

> From food are born all creatures that live on earth; afterwards they live on food and when they die they return to food.

The search for food is the foundation of all other quests. The desire for plenty – from hunting, fishing, or tillage – is mankind's oldest collective idea.

The earliest civilisations arose when the hunter turned farmer. Agriculture cradled culture. In my own country there are areas which have been under the plough continuously for several thousand years. By a strange quirk of fate, those very lands, where agriculture developed at an early date, are now experiencing shortages of food and are derisively termed 'basket' cases.

One of our national songs describes India as a land well-watered, rich in fruit and dark-green with plant and foliage. History tells us how frequently it has been subjected to famine. There is a record of a twelve-year famine in Magadha soon after Alexander's invasion in the third century BC. In spite of my country's fabled riches, large numbers of its people have known hunger through the centuries. Foreign rule, which produced an outflow of resources, made matters worse. Mahatma Gandhi once said that to the poor, God can only appear in the form of bread. For me, and for many of my contemporaries, the Great Bengal Famine in the early 1940s, in which three million or more were allowed to die, is the final memory of foreign rule in India. We vowed never to let this happen again.

Free India can legitimately claim that, in spite of many severe droughts, starvation has been prevented. To achieve this, we had to import grain for many years. When I became Prime Minister, in 1966, we were in the midst of drought and famine conditions. We cannot control the monsoon, but I determined that we should be better prepared to meet any such future calamity. I remember vividly tracking the movement of every ship and train in order to be sure that food was actually getting to the places where it was most needed. This experience impelled us to give the top-most priority to self-sufficiency in food. In the early 'seventies, just when experts forecast irredeemable deficits, we finally became self-sufficient in grain. Apart from taking care of the normal grain requirement of fourteen per cent of the world's population, in 1979–80 India was able to overcome the century's worst drought, one that affected thirty-eight million hectares of farmland and more than two hundred and twenty million people in eleven major states. We were also able to help some of our neighbours.

Since the mid-seventies we have had fairly large buffer stocks. But there is no room for complacency. Our self-sufficiency might not survive a series of droughts. But that it was achieved at all is a tribute to our national will, to the good sense and hard work of the Indian farmer and to his readiness to take help from science and the administration.

A combination of factors has contributed to the doubling, or near trebling, of grain output – the priority given by Jawaharlal Nehru to agriculture in his planning strategy, the emphasis he gave to an infrastructure of irrigation, power, and scientific research and to extension services, together with tenancy reforms which gave land rights to millions, and the construction of a network of credit and markets.

Food self-sufficiency was attained largely by mobilising large and medium-size farmers. We were aware that the green revolution, as it has been called, exacerbated some problems in rural areas, especially the disparities between large and small farmers and the tensions between landowners and labourers. But at that time our paramount objective was to be free of imports. Simultaneously, we drew up special programmes for small farmers to consolidate their gains in production by extending inputs to them and making their occupation viable. Indian experience has also discovered the significant fact that farm productivity is, by and large, unrelated to the size of the farm. This is great news to all over-populated agro-based developing countries. We are also devising programmes of alternative employment for the landless. Our family planning campaign is another essential element in our drive for self-sufficiency in food, as well as for the general enhancement of living standards. A fact which is not easily understood in Europe is that illiteracy did not prevent our farmers from taking advantage of new knowledge. They have a long tradition of learning from seeing and hearing.

Many were the critics within India, and elsewhere, who decried our strategy of development and accused us of advancing industry at the cost of agriculture. Agricultural development cannot be conceived in isolation from industrial development, or economic development, in its totality. For the supply of its input and the demand for its output, agriculture depends on industry. The growth of agricultural productivity is conditioned by employment opportunities elsewhere, by the availability of supplies at increasingly cheaper rates and the absorption of its own produce at remunerative prices. In an attempt to increase the rate of development, some countries have diverted their agricultural savings or surplus to industry. This helped to augment industrial development significantly but it did keep down investment in agriculture. In India, where the majority of people are supported by agriculture, progressively higher investment must be made to increase agricultural output and productivity. This is our policy, as can be demonstrated by the rates of agricultural investment in different Plan periods. But the idea that agricultural development can be sustained by neglecting industrialisation is equally erroneous. The two sectors are inter-dependent and the growth of the one is integrally linked with that of the other.

We, who follow Jawaharlal Nehru's strategy, are concentrating on building secure foundations for self-reliance. Currently, our emphasis is on:

(i) Implementing schemes to reduce poverty, especially in backward areas and among the weakest sections of the population, by development of the rural areas, by generating employment and purchasing power, and by transferring the productive assets of land and livestock to them;

(ii) promoting agricultural research that has relevance to local conditions, and taking the fruits of that research into the field through 'Lab to Land' and other programmes;

(iii) increasing agricultural production in all its aspects by enlarging the area under irrigation; and by providing better credit facilities and ensuring remunerative prices to farmers, together with facilities for marketing, storage, processing and transportation; and

(iv) a food management programme which involves adequate buffer stocks, proper storage, and an extensive public distribution system to make food-grains available at assured prices to consumers all over the country.

We have long been aware of the relation between land reform and rural development. Social evolution was arrested by the old feudal order and colonial rule, which denied us many decades of progress. Soon after independence was achieved, land reform was given priority. In the past, land ownership and tenurial rights were weighted against the poor and the weak. It has been an uphill task to bring about the desired shifts in the ownership of land and livestock from the richer to the poorer sections. While still not satisfactory, we have made significant progress in most parts of India, creating ceilings on land ownership and conferring security of tenure. Above all, we have succeeded in changing the old psychology of looking upon land as a status symbol and source of security, rather than as an important means of production. Based on a given land-to-man ratio, a uniform pattern of ceilings on land holdings, as low as between fifty and eighty acres per family, has been introduced, and is in the process of implementation. These laws are being obeyed, not only administratively, but in the sense that the landlord community is reconciling itself to them. We are determined to complete this process, and the distribution of surplus land, soon. One of our states, the Punjab, which now has some of the most notable productivity levels in the world, was able to make its rapid advance when new varieties of wheat and rice were introduced in 1967 and the years that followed. But this was mainly because it was endowed with the three prerequisites for the rapid adoption and diffusion of new technology – owner cultivation, rural communication and rural electrification.

A rural economy can be made more efficient by decentralising production and by supporting marketing with centralised services in key areas. Our co-operative dairy movement, which began in Gujarat and has now spread to other parts of India, shows what it is possible to achieve. Under the National Dairy Programme, known as 'Operation Flood', which was launched in 1970, the number of village milk producers' co-operatives in India has risen from one thousand, five hundred to twelve thousand. Altogether some 1.6 million rural milk producers and their families participate. Recent studies show that more than half of those who thus benefit are landless labourers and marginal farmers who have less than two hectares of land. For these poor people, in particular, milk earnings are vital. Helped by their co-operatives, landless families can double their incomes by increasing their sales of milk. Moreover, milk provides a daily income that is often collected directly by the women who actually tend the milch animals. This programme is now being expanded to cover ten million farming families during the next five years. We are grateful to FAO and the World Food Programme for their support for this project, and hope to have similar co-operative organisations in horticulture, aquaculture and agro-forestry. The collective strength of small farmers and fisher-folk will help them to mobilise more resources and to take bigger risks.

I have referred at some length to the Indian experience because it is one that I know and because I wanted to make the point that if a nation of six hundred and eighty-three million can manage to feed itself, the challenge of hunger cannot be insurmountable. I am aware of our shortcomings and of how much we still have to do. Many problems remain – the challenge of disparities, the plight of the landless and the under-employed, and the need for a more nutritious diet, and new and energy-conserving methods of food production. The higher production levels of the last few years have been achieved through a liberal input of energy. Agriculture, not only in India but everywhere, even in advanced countries, must learn to produce more for a smaller input of energy, and with less fertiliser and fuel-using farm machinery.

If we look at world agriculture, we find a shrinkage of food production over the last decade. With the rise in population and the levels of inflation experienced in most countries, this causes anxiety. The absolute number of underfed people is not diminishing fast enough. Indeed, there are signs that it could be rising. And this at a time when the world as a whole has the knowledge, the technological means, and the funds, to eradicate want. Obviously our political and other institutions have not kept pace with our capacities and our expectations. Many individual nations also lack the means. That is what makes interdependence so urgent.

There has been inter-dependence throughout the centuries. The plants and genetic material of one country have travelled to, or been consciously introduced into, others. There are stimulating controversies as to which fruit or tree was imported from which country or continent. The most recent example of this widespread intercontinental exchange is found in the agricultural research centres in India where hundreds of samples of paddy seed, wheat, cotton, groundnut, etc., from distant countries are being used to develop special strains which have the characteristics and resistances required under local conditions. The quest continues unabated, the most crucial contribution being made by progressive farmers, both big and small.

There has been trade in produce. In the colonial era, interdependence took the form of the transfer of agricultural produce from the colonies to metropolitan countries, in large quantities and at low prices. The emphasis was on the cultivation of raw materials to supply the industry of colonial powers. Cotton, oilseed, indigo (in earlier days) and plantation crops like coffee, tea, cocoa, rubber and spices were the crops concerned. In the post-colonial era, producing countries have not entirely been able to change this pattern of dependence on marketing avenues. When crops are good, international prices fall. When crops are poor, the market is so manipulated that the profits go to the traders and middlemen, and escape the producer. The share in world trade of weaker nations, particularly those with single-crop economies, is dwindling.

The incapacity to organise an international trade in agricultural commodities which can sustain production and consumption everywhere is as true of plantation and industrial crops, as it is of foodgrains. The adoption of a new International Wheat Trade Agreement, designed to guarantee the stability of the market and the availability of supplies, has been thwarted. The world's major producers are unwilling to give up the advantages conferred by so-called free-market forces or the opportunity to use food as a political weapon. High prices are charged for such essential agricultural input as fertiliser and pesticide, which take them beyond the reach of those who need them most. Discriminatory agricultural protectionism, in industrial countries, is as high as seven hundred per cent on a number of processed agricultural products. An UNCTAD study of forty-six items shows that a fifty per cent reduction would help developing countries to achieve a trade expansion of three billion dollars, or an increase of thirty-five per cent over the 1977 value of their exports.

The targets of ten million tonnes under the Food Aid Convention and of five million tonnes to which the International Emergency Food Reserve is committed – themselves low compared to a minimum computed requirement of twice those figures – are yet to be fulfilled, despite repeated exhortations in all the relevant United Nations bodies. I am glad, however, that the resources needed by the International Fund for Agricultural Development, for its 1981–3 programme of work, are in sight, and that the International Monetary Fund has established a 'food facility' to allow compensatory drawings by countries with balance of payments difficulties resulting from the extra cost of importing food. This will give at least some relief to those developing countries which have periodical crop failures. Such gestures of assistance deserve appreciation, but the more important international programmes still do not have the necessary support. The poor response to the plea of the World Food Programme for a contribution of one billion dollars for the 1980–2 period, the failure to meet the target for development assistance of 0.7 per cent of GNP, and the continuing delay in evolving a new Wheat Trade Agreement, are all indicative of reluctance to come to grips with some of the basic elements of global food security.

These trends make it imperative for developing countries to pursue a policy of collective self-reliance, especially where food is concerned, with the utmost determination and vigour. In the short run and in crisis situations, external assistance from affluent countries does help. But the increase of external investment, or concessional financial facilities alone, cannot be a lasting remedy for the ills of the developing world. Developing countries must do their utmost to attain self-sufficiency within the shortest possible time.

A growing awareness of the ecological inter-dependence of nations and the deepening energy crisis will, in the end, probably be the cementing factors in bringing the One World concept closer to reality. Experts believe that the steady increase of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, because of the large amounts of fossil fuels being burnt, may lead to changes of temperature early in the next century. Although the precise impact of such changes cannot yet be predicted, many experts feel that they may be harmful to some of the highly productive farming regions of northern latitudes. This clearly indicates that on considerations of ecological security, too, we will have to build an edifice that provides effective food security on a global scale, one that encompasses both the South and the North.

The productive capacity of land and water can be improved by the action of man. Several rivers of sorrow can be converted into streams of wealth, by co-operation between nations sharing international rivers. The genetic resources of plants and animals constitute a common heritage and deserve to be conserved and utilised in a co-operative manner. The march of deserts and the destruction of the biological potential of land can be arrested in many cases through regional and international co-operation. Warnings through global and regional weather watch arrangements help to minimise damage to crops from fluctuations in the weather. Pest and pathogens do not respect political boundaries. Through co-ordinated action, organised under the auspices of FAO, we have, for example, curbed locust invasions.

I believe the equitable distribution of our conventional stocks of energy, and the joint development of new and renewable resources, will test the enlightened will of nations to survive in comfort, harmony and dignity. Oil exporting countries often have liquid gold beneath sterile sand. In 1979 six oil-rich countries in West Asia alone imported about six million tonnes of cereal, valued at about $1.6 billion. But this money went to the affluent nations. Meaningful co-operation between developing countries, with untapped agricultural production potential, and oil-rich countries, with surplus financial resources, but with deficit food budgets, could make an enormous difference.

Agriculture is the most important source of renewable wealth. Where there is no shortage of land, biogass programmes can solve many energy problems. India cannot afford diversion of land to the production of alcohol whilst a growing population has to be adequately fed. Through intelligent and carefully planned social forestry programmes, however, we can produce the fuel, fodder and fertiliser needed in the rural areas. For small farmers, the cultivation of horticultural crops is a desirable form of land use, providing nutrition and income. Deficiencies in post-harvest technology, however, deny the poor cultivator a proper return on his production. Social forestry and horticulture on every piece of vacant land is one way of harvesting considerable quantities of solar energy. This will be the real green revolution.

Every country should give greater attention to the preservation of forests. A five thousand year old Indus Valley seal depicts two thoughtless men pulling up two trees by their roots. From the centre springs a figure, the spirit of the tree who, with outstretched arms, demands an end of this destruction. We have a contemporary version of local women putting their arms around trees to prevent felling. There is an old adage in Kashmir that food will last so long as forests do. ('*Ann poshi tele yeli poshi van*' – Sheikh Nur-ud-Din Wali.) The close relationship between food production and forestry is well known, but generally ignored in practice. The pressure of industrialisation, urbanisation and the growing demand for agricultural products is causing reckless deforestation in many regions. Forest products for *bona fide* use, including timber for local housing, are becoming ever more inaccessible to the rural poor. The real energy crisis facing millions in developing countries is the scarcity of wood for fuel. The scientific management of forest resources, with special care for watersheds and wildlife, would help the voiceless millions, and ensure long-term national welfare.

The introduction of technologies, without adequate understanding of their impact on employment and other social consequences, leads to distress. People, more particularly rural women, are displaced from traditional occupations. Millions of our women earn their living by such means as selling fruit and vegetables, processing farm produce and drying and storing grain. They are also concerned with energy management, that is the collection and utilisation of agricultural and animal waste, and with post-harvest technology. Energy-intensive and labour-displacing techniques, which developed nations have introduced into post-harvest technology, and which make greater demands on energy resources, are a threat to their livelihood.

Wherever it is beneficial, the latest technology should be adopted. There are many areas where technology and human labour do not compete for jobs – satellite photography for resource mapping, climate prediction, and the aerial seeding of trees in desert and hill areas. Techniques of capture and culture fisheries, in inland waters and in the oceans, can be improved. Modern systems of soil, plant and animal health-care must be developed. The latest techniques of communication are essential. Computers to develop climatic models will assist us in the introduction of alternative cropping strategies, contingency plans and compensatory production programmes in order to reduce the adverse impact of aberrant weather. Recent advances in genetic engineering and bio-technology are useful for a wide variety of purposes in agriculture, animal husbandry, fisheries and forestry. These and many other fields provide us with opportunities to achieve quantum jumps in technological progress.

The latest technology of the developed nations may not, however, be best suited for the developing countries. Technology should be determined by need, and if we accept this, it opens up a whole vista of original technologies being independently developed. Another important factor to be borne in mind is that developing countries cannot afford the wasteful luxury of switching technologies too often, without giving a fair trial to any of them.

The assimilation of technology is not simply a matter of calculating costs and benefits, the price of machinery, the costs of labour displacement and the revenues from the manufactured product. Technology has an impact on society – on modes of living and on relationships between people and institutions. Technological change cannot be abruptly imposed. It has to be a process of evolution. However modern, however beneficial, a technology, it has to fit in with the indigenous culture, and harmoniously transform tradition into modernity.

Planning for agricultural advance must necessarily be indigenous though guided by the global perspective. The starting point is the preparation of reliable, and compact, agricultural balance-sheets, using modern techniques of resource surveying, based on remote sensing and aerial mapping. Champions of 'appropriate' technology would sometimes like developing countries to confine themselves to obsolete technology. Obsolescence is as undesirable in developing nations as in developed ones.

A national Food Security System cannot wait for the lead of some international body. A country's citizens are the responsibility of the government which claims their allegiance. Governments of the developing world have borne burdens unknown to the administrators of affluent societies. Much of the disparity and exploitation, against which we struggle in the international sphere, mocks us at home. There can be no enduring solution to hunger unless we end social and economic inequality, but our efforts are hampered by other competing values set by affluent societies, but undreamt of during their own period of struggle. The paucity of food supplies is only a part of the immediate problem, even though it poses a major threat to the future. Many of us are growing the food that we need, but it is still not within the reach of every mouth. To have a permanent impact, National Food Security must have an umbrella of social security.

Food security requires more than the periodic generosity of the rich. Hunger has to be tackled through conscious institutional reform within nations and between nations, and not just by overhauling technology or supplementing the supply of food. Technology is not a total answer, nor will a change in it automatically change institutions. An effective world food security system must eliminate the institutional whims and vagaries that create artificial scarcity. They must ensure buffer stocks for unforeseen and unavoidable emergencies. We have very little positive control over nature but let us not be subordinated by our institutions.

The world has the technological capability and the financial resources necessary to eliminate hunger and malnutrition by the end of this decade. Only three per cent of the current world cereal production is enough to eliminate hunger immediately. Yet we find the Freedom From Hunger Campaign launched by FAO, at the initiative of its distinguished past Director-General, Dr B. R. Sen, receiving little attention or support. The entire world faces a monumental challenge in the fight against malnutrition and hunger.

So far we have spoken of national and international initiatives to produce more food and improve distribution. Hungry or satiate, we are shadowed by a greater threat of devastation – the awesome arsenals of nuclear and other weapons. Are we to struggle against the desperation of hunger, only to see the world blown asunder? Are we to preserve the human body in health and vitality, only to sacrifice it on the altar of war? Hunger is generally the most common cause of violence in animals or in humans. Wars have been fought for food, for territory, for honour. But ironically, it is not the hungry who are belligerent today, it is those who have plenty.

Eminent economists say that if the present daily world expenditure of about $1.3 billion were frozen even at this level, the money to eliminate hunger could easily be found. The expenditure incurred on a new intercontinental missile could plant two hundred million trees, irrigate one million hectares, feed fifty million under-nourished children in developing countries, buy a million tonnes of fertiliser, erect a million small bio-gas plants, build sixty-four thousand health care centres or three million, four hundred thousand primary schools. The strategic Hunger Elimination Treaty, which President Kenneth Kaunda advocated in an earlier lecture in this series, coupled with progressive disarmament, contains a worthwhile programme.

It was with the use of the plough that the human species first became conscious of the earth as the bountiful mother, and touched it with sanctity.

The earth has been ravaged, desecrated, made sterile – perhaps through ignorance in the early stages but lately through greed and arrogance. Today it is not the ignorant but the knowing who pose the main danger to mankind's survival. Knowledge no longer leads to the realisation of Truth. There is little visible concern over misery or violence. We talk of a crisis of the environment, or crisis in human consciousness, and a crisis in human values; but we do not see it as a breakdown of, and confusion in, a complex pattern of relationships.

Recognition that human actions determine the future of the raw material of life must awaken us to our responsibilities. Through education we must re-establish the sacred dimension that views the resources of the world – the air and space, the earth, water, plants animals – as a common heritage to nurture and use frugally. Life can survive only through deep awareness of the globe as one, and through a sharing of the earth's riches in harmony, without unsettling the equilibrium or disturbing the natural laws.

The prosperity of any single country is linked to that of the rest of the world. Such inter-dependence between free nations, of benefit to all, presupposes the self-reliance of every nation, as well as the recognition that the small and the weak not only can but should, also, contribute to the common cause. A beautiful parable narrated by our poet, Rabindranath Tagore, comes to my mind: 'Who among you will take up the duty of feeding the hungry?' Lord Buddha asked his followers when famine raged at Shravasti. Ratnakar, the banker, hung his head and said, 'Much more is needed than all my wealth to feed the hungry.' Jayasen, the chief of the King's army, said, 'I would gladly give my life's blood, but there is not enough food in my house.'

Dharmapal, who owned broad acres of land, said with a sigh, 'The drought demon has sucked my fields dry. I know not how to pay the King's dues.'

Then rose Supriya, the mendicant's daughter. She bowed to all and meekly said, 'I will feed the hungry.'

'How!' they cried in surprise. 'How can you hope to fulfil that vow?'

'I am the poorest of you all,' said Supriya, 'that is my strength. I have my coffer and my store at each of your houses.'

29

'India's Intellectual Tradition'

Address at University of Sorbonne, Paris, 13 November 1981

To be in France, the home of freedom and the fount of so much of human kind's philosophical, aesthetic and scientific creativity is a privilege. To receive a degree from the Sorbonne is an exceptional honour, for this University is synonymous with intellectual daring and excellence. I take this to be a tribute not to me but to the culture and civilisation of which I am a product.

The reputation of India's spiritualism has been such that the sturdiness of its intellectual tradition is often overlooked. Old Indian thought has been described as 'Freedom intoxicated' – freedom here signifying release of the spirit from involvement in matter. But there was no lack of emphasis on the reality of the world. There was an aggressive intellectuality about our scriptures. They did not give in to escapism but placed emphasis on a happier life in this world.

Ancient India took intuition as the highest form of the intellect. But in so far as it held the arena, the intellectual process was incisive, unsparing and all-inclusive. The quest was marked by depth, and not merely by breadth. There was hardly any field of knowledge which was not explored minutely. Its sweep extended from the infinitely small to the infinitely large, making the knower realise how much he did not know.

Down the centuries there have been lively debates on the nature of reality, and disputations between deists and non-deists. In fact two of India's great religions, Buddhism and Jainism, are non-deistic. Although the idealist *Vendanta* has attracted wide attention, less well known are the old materialist schools like the *Lokavata* and the *Sankhya* which pursued relentless logic. The biologist Haldane, atheist and humanist, considered *Sankhya* to be a system in which the most modern scientist could feel at home.

It was a crucible in which different narrow elements fused, gaining energy and capacity for pliant investigation. It was able to transcend, yet hold, the material world of the outer, and the religious world of the inner. An ancient text says: 'There is only one, but it is perceived variously.'

The Indian intellect has valued not only belief but doubt. 'Philosophical argument,' wrote an early thinker, 'can have no relevance for that which is totally unknown or that which is fully known. It has relevance only for that about which there is some doubt.' Such was the flexibility of the best of Indian thought.

Louis Renou notes the attention which Indian thought gave to developing methods of analysis and exposition, to establishing classifications, definitions and a precise technical vocabulary. Numerous were the subjects which the Indian intellect probed with thoroughness long before others began to think of them – politics, economics, astronomy, mathematics, chemistry, medicine, psychology, logic, phonetics, etc. Grammar, and with it linguistics, were regarded as among the most important of the sciences. Panini, of the third century BC, drew his data from dialect, folklore and local customs.

Even by the tenth century, however, the remarkable Arab scholar, Al-Beruni, writing about the state of Indian science and philosophy, regrettably commented that Indian scholars had lost much of their inquisitiveness and had developed a certain self-sufficiency.

So overladen became the palimpsest of myths, legends and rituals that my father could write of the 'Burden of the Past', quoting Nietzsche's lament 'Not only the wisdom of the centuries but also their madness breaketh out in us. Dangerous is it to be an heir.' Colonial powers ridiculed the culture, language, clothing and customs of their colonies. And we ourselves chose, or were induced, to forget who and what we were, because our rulers needed administrators, professionals and workers. They introduced some education to produce cogs for the imperial wheel, but there was no way to stop other concepts from seeping in too, and we eagerly grasped ideas like the Rights of Man which arose in France and became the banner of European enlightenment. Thirsty for ideas and for a more complete freedom, questing spirits in our country were attracted by the daring of the statement, 'I think, therefore I am'. They compared it to the ancient Indian observation 'I am that which is' (Tattwan Asi), or as J. Krishnamurty, putting it into contemporary language, said: 'The thinker and the thought are one'.

While European scholars were discovering the East, our own liberation was helped by their incisive reasoning. Traditional concepts of East and West are now obsolete. I refer not to political or military blocs but to cultures and civilisations and the sense in which Kipling used the words. The twain have not only met but are the warp and woof of the human fabric. Change is continuous and accelerating. The same label can never be attached for long to either individuals or countries. We may be Indian or French or whatever, but first we are human beings with urges and aches that are basically similar, whatever the outside packaging. Even the most 'Indian' of our great personalities, like Rabindranath Tagore (1861–1941), Mahatma Gandhi (1869–1948), and Sri Aurobindo (1972–1950), were amalgams of East and West. Mahatma Gandhi's extraordinary power as a political leader was due as much to western jurisprudence, and legal logic, as to eastern intuition and ascetic idiom. Where else but in India could a terrorist revolutionary like Sri Aurobindo change into a revolutionary of the spirit?

Many in the West, alienated by the acquisitive society, have been turning to the East for spiritual light, even as the young in our countries look westward, dazzled by its glitter. A barter trade in deception, this spiritualism is no more a consumer good than is technology. Each has to be internalised through a dedicated period of self-discipline, what we in India call *tapas*, or *yoga*, which is essentially a form of physical, mental and spiritual self-control.

Technology, which facilitates the communication of ideas and the implanting of impressions, demands a new kind of individual, one who will relate to the universal society rather than the circumstantial community. The new 'Earth Citizen' cannot deny his or her local provenance, expressed in language, song, dance, epic and legend, but he should also be able to draw from other sources of experience.

The present crisis of civilisation is produced not so much by the clash of cultures as the problem of violence, not only that which is stored in nuclear arsenals but the growing and pointless violence and callousness of ordinary people. In the last few centuries, under the impetus of the industrial revolution, governments, industry and professions have concentrated on what is called 'efficiency'. Greater consumption but less satisfaction, the problem of the affluent individual throughout history, has now become the problem of entire nations. Education, the purpose of which was originally to enable the individual to come to terms with life, often unbalances. It is education for efficiency, not for harmony. The educated are unable to reconcile the 'two cultures', the humanities and the sciences, still less is he able to assimilate their distinctive inner personalities. Progress has dried the springs of spontaneity.

As knowledge grows, so does ignorance. Not only is there too much to know but we become lost in statistics and torrents of information, and we miss the real meaning or ultimate purpose. In a more confident age, it was the French who thought of encompassing the whole corpus of knowledge in an encyclopaedia. In spite of the revolution in communications, access to significant knowledge is tenuous. When we consider that decisions affecting millions of people, and billions yet unborn, are being made every day by those who are not even aware of their own ignorance, we can only marvel at the providence which keeps the world going. Now more than ever we miss and seek the grand synthesis. So many are in search of masters or Gurus for guidance. But the truth lies within ourselves and each has to discover it for himself.

Proliferating knowledge calls for constant sifting and selection. But who has the time or the desire? We oversimplify situations, attaching labels to people and ideas, shoving them into pigeon-holes, clinging to stereotypes.

Rapid scientific developments have enabled some human beings to escape the gravity of the earth, and to look down upon its roundness as actuality. This view of cosmic totality should have ended all divisions and jolted us out of our limited world. Yet the sense of wholeness evades us, as does the realisation that man is one tiny element in the cosmos, and that all life and nature are inter-related and no element can isolate itself. It is chastening to remember that long before our modern experience, Teilhard De Chardin, one of France's great thinkers, called the universe, 'The Great Indivisible'. The ancient Indian concept, the essence of *Vedanta*, is that 'being' is one and indivisible, life and death, pleasure and pain, body, mind and spirit are all so intricately intertwined as to be inseparable, and forever reacting to one another. As a body needs space to breathe and exist, so does the mind or spirit, call it what you will, need space inside, space to think and space to be all of oneself.

How is it that human kind can reach out for the stars, but finds the challenges of expanding population, technological advancement and deployment of energy, too complex, to say nothing of nourishing mother earth so as to achieve greater productivity?

Until now history has been the record of conflicts between races and nations, of the break-up of social structures, of a growing separation from life-sustaining sources. We lead divided lives as individuals, citizens, classes, professions, ethnic groups, nationalities, even as a species. Our sensibilities are fragmented by the different roles we are called upon to play. The integral quality of a person, at home with himself and society, is lost. How to reconcile our material and spiritual needs, our cognitive and instinctive experience, our aesthetic and moral sensibility, is the question few of us ever ask. Living and functioning in giant organisational networks, the individual has disappeared in the civic intermesh and, uncertain of his own will or identity, he loses his autonomy. The solace of established religion, and the security of social tradition, no longer suffices.

Words change their meaning, or disappear from our vocabulary, and the mind negates the dimensions of the ethos. Whether the person moves inward into the divided self or outward into the divided world, the nightmare of a vast, estranging structure closes in, causing alienation and incoherence. There is no sense of the sanctity of life or of his relations with nature, and with human beings of all races. We do not see goodness as a state of being untainted, or as having anything to do with the texture of a culture or a civilisation. And the same goes for compassion, that abounding fulness that does not diminish in the giving.

Biologists tell us that we use only an infinitesimal portion of our brain. The rest remains unexplored. Perhaps this is one reason for our limitations. The new adventurers have to be investigators, with lateral as well as vertical vision, to stretch the frontiers of their awareness. We must have new priorities, the capacity to observe, to think, to act with sympathy and strength.

This action of the total brain may be the intelligence that will transcend all barriers and bring us to perceive life, and the world, as an organic whole. To have order without, there has to be order within.

The world of science is investigating the ground from which all life springs. The tremendous discoveries taking place in biogenetic science are bringing man to the threshold of new comprehension of life, just as yesterday's discoveries in physics erased the dividing line between the within and the without. Wise people had always known that the observer is the participator, now the quantum physicist confirms it. Man is not a mere observer of outer phenomena, but a participator.

The modern child apparently has an in-built understanding which was denied to us. Belonging as I do to the older generation, I have not lost my sense of wonder at each new discovery. Not just because of their capacity to improve comfort and speed or even to solve problems, but because of their power to negate the evils of earlier periods, in short, to transform the earth and to uplift the human race to higher levels. So science must march on, and man must keep pace. There must be a clear recognition of the needs of the people, and there must be the will to take action to satisfy them. Without the banks on either side there can be no river. Science and technology can be of benefit when controlled and used properly and with discrimination. Needless to say, I do not consider the stock-piling of lethal nuclear weapons as a proper use of science, and I share the concern of Europe on this issue. We have killed and died for the absurd. If and when nuclear weapons are used it may well turn out to be the result of some trivial provocation, and the innocent would probably be the first to be annihilated.

Consciousness of this grave danger of nuclear war is growing. It is no less crucial to be aware of the threat posed by the disparities within countries, as of those between countries. On the positive side there is the necessity for deeper anxiety over the growth of the human personality. The wholeness of the earth can come about only with the wholeness of the human beings.

Man has attempted and achieved the impossible. We look to centres of learning, and especially to a prestigious institution like the Sorbonne, to dispel darkness and to illuminate the path of the future.

Gandhi Memorial College
SRINAGAR
Acc. No: ..1857.....
Dated: ....

G.M.C.E.J
1857

continued from front flap

Finally, she champions the cause of science, which she regards as 'the key to the new world for which we longed', the key, in fact, that will provide for the East the prosperity now enjoyed by the West. She is not blind, however, to the dangers inherent in the introduction of new technologies, for she sees clearly that science can exacerbate the ills that it is called in to cure. Because of technological advance, the gap between the richer and poorer nations is still widening, and the same effect can be seen even within countries: farmers who can afford to invest in new technology, for example, become richer, those who cannot become poorer.

At the same time she fully understands the limitations imposed by circumstance. Nations cannot industrialise or modernise overnight. Fertiliser has to be imported and paid for. Electrification involves immense investment and makes great demands on sources of energy. Nevertheless, she is proud of the great advances that India has made under the leadership of her father and herself.

It has, for example, quadrupled its output of wheat, and is now self-sufficient in food. She stresses that there have been no famines, with their hideous death-tolls, since she took over.

Mrs. Gandhi's cause is a noble one, and in many ways she is an inspiring advocate.

Jacket design: Jefferson Godwin

ISBN 0 340 28659 8

'The time has come to rise above pettiness and to break down meaningless barriers, to join together not just for better things but to reach out for the values which could make us better beings; each one of us adding something, no matter how small, to the total of the world's dignity and courage, its happiness and goodness, its beauty and wisdom.'

– Indira Gandhi